

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

108

1 And it's on the river, the lot that we have there. That's  
2 where I grew up. It's my home. So, of course, I'm opposed  
3 to this. And I take some insult of this company. They've  
4 offered pittance to these people for their land.

5 And I take offense to the review, the  
6 environmental review that says that the landowners were, you  
7 know, fairly paid or fairly offered money. They weren't.

8 So, I -- and I wanted to say that I've heard  
9 people say that the pipeline will go in safely. I watched  
10 as the pipeline went in, in 2005, to the coast, to take gas  
11 to the coast. And everyone was excited about that, and it  
12 was 10 inches, came down the Coos Bay Wagon Road, the  
13 historic road. It ruined the road. There was frack outs on  
14 every stream. And if you will go to Crook County and ask  
15 them they're still fixing the frack outs.

16 I know the environmental company that's  
17 overseeing the environmental fixes right now this many years  
18 later, so they hire the cheapest contractor that they can  
19 find, and they bring them from Texas where they came from,  
20 and so please do not believe them.

21 I've worked in building housing for many years,  
22 so I know about environmental reviews. I know what you can  
23 pick and choose. So, I don't know who did this one, but I  
24 started reading through it today and I was like, oh my God.  
25 And I'm opposed to this environmental review because it's

PM2-70

**PM2**

**Continued, page 108 of 152**

PM2-70

Section 4.9.2.3 says that Pacific Connector would need to negotiate a mutually agreed compensation amount with the landowner. If the landowner and company cannot reach agreement, and eminent domain is used, compensation for the easement would be determined by a court. The Coos Bay pipeline along the Coos Wagon Road was non-jurisdictional. Safety for the Pacific Connector pipeline is addressed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

109

1 flawed. The rational about taking -- I think it said taking  
2 the whole -- the whole thing. Sure, there's going to be  
3 impacts, but if you take the whole thing it's okay because  
4 the impacts over the whole thing are okay. Well, they're  
5 not. If I put housing in Ashland, for instance, I had a  
6 50-foot wetland, I'm done.

7 So, DEQ, help us. By your own words, you've  
8 limited this to this -- you've limited the document, like  
9 the fracking and all of that they've talked about, but you  
10 have not addressed environmental justice in a truthful way  
11 and you need to.

12 And it will impact small landowners. All four  
13 counties are above the poverty level for Oregon and the  
14 nation. And of course they went to Coos County, the poorest  
15 county, and they said, here, we'll buy you off.

16 Okay, 196 countries this week at the global  
17 summit said we have to do something in order to not surpass  
18 the 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I know you want to wrap up  
20 right now, Betty.

21 MS. MCROBERTS: I will. So, it's going to cost a  
22 \$100 billion a year to fix the poor countries that are going  
23 to be impacted.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. Dan  
25 Bailey.

PM2-71

PM2

Continued, page 109 of 152

PM2-71

Environmental justice is addressed in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PM2

Continued, page 110 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 110

1 MR. BAILEY: Hello. My name is Dan Bailey. I am  
2 the president of Southern -- oh, it's D-a-n, B-a-i-l-e-y. I  
3 am the president of the Southern Oregon Building and  
4 Construction Trades Council, and I'm a member of Local 290,  
5 Plumbers and Steamfitters.

6 I would like to start out by thanking FERC for  
7 this open forum and allowing everyone to speak.

8 At nearly 6 billion, Jordan Cove and Pacific  
9 Connector will be the largest private investment in the  
10 history of Oregon. At peak, on both projects there will be  
11 approximately 3500 construction jobs. A lot of the money  
12 those workers make would be spent in the local communities  
13 for hotels, RVs, groceries, restaurants, and fuel.

14 This, in turn, would help to boost the local  
15 economy by paying family wages with healthcare and pension  
16 benefits, strengthen tax bases, and reduce the burden on  
17 taxpayers by lowering the number of unemployed workers.

18 This project would also allow training for new  
19 worker -- excuse me -- a new workforce through our  
20 apprenticeship programs. We want the permitting agencies to  
21 do their due diligence just as much as the opposition and do  
22 so in a way that won't put our families in harm's way and  
23 doesn't cause undue harm to our environment. We believe the  
24 Draft Environmental Impact Statement ensures this, and thank  
25 you for your time.

PM2

Continued, page 111 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 111

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for comments. Next is  
2 Jeff McGillivray.

3 MR. MCGILLIVRAY: Yeah, I'm Jeff McGillivray,  
4 J-e-f-f, M-c-g-i-l-i-v-r-a-y. I'm also a member of Local  
5 290.

6 Speaking late in the meeting doesn't leave a lot  
7 of stuff to talk about, so I won't spend too much time. I  
8 do want to say I do appreciate we are recognized for our  
9 temporary work. I got into the construction trade right out  
10 of high school, for 22 years all I've known is temporary  
11 jobs, and it's made a great living for me and my family.

12 Beyond the construction jobs, beyond the plant  
13 facility jobs, the grocery stores, all the recreation money  
14 that's going to come in, something else that hasn't been  
15 mentioned is the increased tax revenue. And if anybody's  
16 been down in the Coos Bay area, you know the law enforcement  
17 and the fire safety is just devastated. They have no  
18 coverage. It's in bad need of that help. The schools are  
19 run down, falling apart. All that would help it.

20 And then, as far as our members, our brothers  
21 have said it before here tonight, we would not sacrifice  
22 jobs for the environment and you know the speaker -- the  
23 lady before Dan there mentioned the 10-inch line down there.  
24 That was done by non-union pipeline outfit and it was a  
25 disaster, but I want to go on the record we don't build them



PM2

Continued, page 112 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

112

1 I like that. Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. The  
3 next speakers are Drew Waits, Lee Lull, Ted Cowan, Scott  
4 McCabe, and Katie. I can't figure out how you write your  
5 name. All right, so everybody please come to the front.

6 MR. WAITS: My name is Drew Waits, D-r-e-w,  
7 W-a-i-t-s. I also am a member of Local 290. I'm a fourth  
8 generation plumber and pipefitter.

9 For over a hundred years my family has been  
10 making a livable wage on temporary jobs. So, I want to  
11 reiterate these temporary jobs are how we raise our  
12 families. And when this job's over we'll go and do another  
13 one. And I love southern Oregon. I've lived here my whole  
14 life. I was born in Klamath. I went to school here, and we  
15 want to keep the environment the same as it is. So,  
16 hopefully, when we do build this pipeline, we'll make the  
17 environment look better when we're done with it. Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. The  
19 next speaker is Lee Lull.

20 MS. LULL: Hi. My name is Lee Lull, L-e-e,  
21 L-u-l-l. I'm a grandmother, and I guess that's who I'm  
22 speaking for, the future generations.

23 First of all, from everything I've been reading  
24 it seems as though there has never been a pipeline that  
25 hasn't leaked somewhere or sometime at some point in time.

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 113

1 And I don't think that's the fault of those who make it. I  
2 just think that's what we have to deal with.

3 The other thing is that I have taken a course  
4 recently on climate change, and I'm a little bit more  
5 conversant than I ever was before with the findings of the  
6 IPCC and so forth. And our Earth is getting warmer. Our  
7 climates are changing. And I just think that this proposed  
8 pipeline is -- I cannot understand the logic behind it. I  
9 don't think there is any logic behind it.

10 I think it's for profit by a few people or a few  
11 companies, but I don't think there's any logic behind it  
12 because it's like the proverbial last straw that is probably  
13 going to help tip us over. And the latest findings from  
14 some scientists anyway seem to think that we have only about  
15 13 to 15 years to get off of our fossil fuels. We don't  
16 want to be adding to our burden now. And I just hope that  
17 all of you people who make these decisions try to read some  
18 of the science and find out what's going on yourselves  
19 before you make these decisions because really don't have  
20 any time left. Thank you.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next  
22 is Ted Cowan.

23 MR. COWAN: So, that's T-e-d, C-o-w-a-n. Thank  
24 you folks for coming out here. What a treat to get to  
25 address you all.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

114

1 I'm a little concerned about your job security.  
2 I wonder if you're really in a position to do this  
3 impartially or what kind of pressures you're under to  
4 produce good results. A lot of this is based on my own  
5 experience with my local BLM folks who are obviously  
6 sweating bullets because they know you just can't cut that  
7 many trees without creating any kind of damage. And my  
8 strong suspicion is that they don't feel that they're going  
9 to continue to be employed if they don't produce their  
10 required results from their employers, the U.S. Government.

11 So, that concerns me. It concerns me a lot that  
12 when something is in gross violation of the established BLM  
13 policies, and God knows how hard a lot of people have worked  
14 to establish those. It's not that they need to redo their  
15 plans so it fits the BLM policies, but the question is  
16 whether or not we redo the BLM policies to fit their plan.  
17 It just doesn't seem right to me. I mean it seems like in  
18 order to get to this point of pretzel logic people must have  
19 known. You people must have known that you couldn't just  
20 say, no, that's crazy. Sorry.

21 If I went up there and I asked to do the same  
22 thing, I would be politely declined. I hope politely. I  
23 suspect so.

24 And so I appeal to you folks. You know, not as  
25 members of the FERC, although that's been done. I appeal to

PM2-72

PM2

Continued, page 114 of 152

PM2-72

As stated in section 4.1 of the EIS and elsewhere, the BLM will consider amending its district plans before making a decision whether or not to grant a right-of-way for the pipeline.

PM2

Continued, page 115 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

115

1 you as human beings. I appeal to you as people who have  
2 children or grandchildren, maybe you have animals or you  
3 have children or grandchildren have animals they love.  
4 Imagine that these same animals out in the forest are very  
5 much the same. We're all the same. We all need a warm  
6 place to be. Right now we're petroleum junkies.

7 I feel that it's sending -- we may as well be  
8 saying if we send the Chinese energy junkies enough whiskey  
9 they'll stop drinking gin. I mean I don't feel good about  
10 being a petroleum junkie. I don't feel good about it. I  
11 don't want to continue to do this. I don't want to continue  
12 to perpetuate these patterns, but as for now I'm stuck.  
13 That's what got me here tonight, but I hope something else  
14 gets us out of this.

15 Again, I'd like to thank you, just appeal to you  
16 as people with hearts as well as brains. I don't know if  
17 there's any place to say help, I'm stuck in an FERC job.  
18 You know maybe fortune cookies. I don't know. But God  
19 bless you all and thank you.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for comment. Scott  
21 McKay, and after Scott is Katie Mallams and then it's  
22 Estelle Volar, Nancy Nelson, and Jennett.

23 MR. MCKAY: Hi. My name is Scott McKay,  
24 S-c-o-t-t, M-c-K-a-y. To the panel, thank you for your  
25 effort to collect public input. I hope you listen.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

116

1 I came here tonight to ask a couple of questions  
2 of those who are proposing the project to put perspective on  
3 the issue. They're not here, but my questions are  
4 rhetorical, so I'll ask them anyway.

5 I live in East Medford just off Main Street, and  
6 I would like to know specifically what benefits in goods or  
7 services or financially my neighbors and I will see from the  
8 proposed pipeline? I gather that there isn't really much,  
9 probably nothing since the money from the project goes to  
10 Canada. The results of the project go to Asia, and there's  
11 just a handful of jobs, not many of them likely to end up  
12 for East Medford people, but maybe a few.

13 Quick follow up, which neighborhoods do benefit  
14 from the proposed pipeline, Canada, Asia? The environmental  
15 and property costs will be ours. It's very clear that very  
16 few in this room will benefit from this project. And  
17 further, very few in this room are in favor of this project.  
18 Further, as you continue this public hearing, I'm very sure  
19 you will find yourself in rooms in which very few support or  
20 benefit from this project.

21 If this is still a government of, by, and for the  
22 people, the decision you need to make is clear. The project  
23 does not look like it's worthy of revising any BLM policies  
24 or land use management policies.

25 You started this meeting by saying FERC has not

| PM2-73

---

**PM2**

**Continued, page 116 of 152**

---

PM2-73

The economic benefits of the Project are discussed in section 4.9 of the EIS. The Commission would not make its decision about whether or not this Project has public benefits until after staff issues the FEIS, so it can consider the environmental impacts disclosed.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

117

PM2

Continued, page 117 of 152

1 yet made the decision to disapprove this project. I have to  
2 ask one more question. Why not?

PM2-73  
continued

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. And  
4 we're guessing Katy? Is that right?

5 MS. MALLAMS: It's Katy, K-a-t-y, Mallams,  
6 M-a-l-l-a-m-s.

7 I'm sorry that I didn't realize that this was  
8 also the hearing regarding amending the Forest and ELM  
9 management plans. So, what I would say particularly to you  
10 Wes is remember the mission of the Forest Service is caring  
11 for the land, the land and serving the people.

12 And also what I had planned to say I'm not going  
13 to say because some of the people who are opposed to this  
14 project have already said it from fracking to eminent domain  
15 to wildlife and water quality and fish impacts. But I would  
16 like to say is really why are there so few good jobs here?  
17 It's not because we need to build more pipelines. It's  
18 because manufacturing jobs in this country, in general, have  
19 gone overseas in a big way. And it's also because the  
20 unions have lost so much of their clout that a lot of the  
21 jobs in this country that could be good jobs, like retail,  
22 are no longer good jobs.

23 But if we start exporting our gas, our gas from  
24 the American land to other countries manufacturing, which  
25 has been up ticking a bit in this country and somewhat

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

118

1 because natural gas, the energy that's needed is quite cheap  
2 right now or cheaper. Those jobs will follow the gas and  
3 the cheap energy and go overseas, and the gains that we've  
4 made in the last few years will go away. So, I would like  
5 people who talk a lot about jobs to remember that.

6 Some that really bothers me about this is that  
7 FERC admits that there would be adverse impacts to this  
8 project, but most of them would not be significant is what  
9 it says in the draft or similar words. Basically, after the  
10 completion of the project the companies take the profits and  
11 we the people here in the State of Oregon is holding the bag  
12 for any of those adverse impacts. And if you think that  
13 we're just abstract things, well, they're not.

14 I have a friend in his thirties now. He grew up  
15 in Birmingham. When he was in high school a friend of his  
16 was out fishing one day, another high school student. Well,  
17 he unfortunately happened to be fishing in a stream where  
18 there was a gas pipeline leak and the gas pipeline exploded  
19 and that kid was killed, and he was just in high school.  
20 So, it's real. It's not just paper impacts. And I think  
21 for these reasons it's just not worth doing this, and FERC  
22 should not approve it. Thank you.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. Next  
24 is Estelle Volar.

25 MS. VOLAR: I'm Estelle Volar. I've lived here

PM2-74

PM2

Continued, page 118 of 152

PM2-74

The Company would have to mitigate any adverse environmental impacts. Section 4.13 of the EIS discusses pipeline safety

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

119

1 in Rogue Valley for over 40 years. I'm a mother, a  
2 stepmother, a foster mother, a grandmother, a great  
3 grandmother, and I've spent most of my life nurturing or  
4 supporting young people and helping them grow and helping to  
5 create the fabric of community that we have here in southern  
6 Oregon.

7 And I ask you to consider the impacts of this  
8 decision on the next seven generations, which is really a  
9 euphemism for saying even more generations in the future. I  
10 am also a member of Southern Oregon Climate Change now. And  
11 I'm very concerned that we're not really paying attention to  
12 the urgency of climate change. The last IPCC panel report  
13 said we have 10 to 13 years to really make a significant  
14 affect on transiting to other economies. We've got to deal  
15 with the affects of climate change.

16 I've just skipped (sic) the report. I haven't  
17 been able to read it entirely, which I will be able doing  
18 and submitting written comments. But the impacts that this  
19 has on climate change is just an essential element to really  
20 focus on. And when evaluating the difference between  
21 natural gas effects or the impacts of natural gas on climate  
22 change and comparing that with coal, it's true that natural  
23 gas has fewer impacts on carbon dioxide, but it has  
24 increasingly or it has many more methane, which is much more  
25 toxic, impactful gas.

PM2-75

**PM2**

**Continued, page 119 of 152**

PM2-75

See the response to IND1-1. The goal of the Project is to export LNG to overseas markets. The additional of other domestic renewable energy resources, such as solar or wind power, would not help achieve that goal.



20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

120

1 You also need to compare, not just with  
2 coal-burning, but with the truly clean and renewable  
3 energies. Investors are going to wind, to solar, to  
4 geothermal to wave to algae, to all sorts of different kinds  
5 of technologies.

6 And if we were really paying for the full cost of  
7 fossil fuel development, if they didn't have all the  
8 subsidies, if they didn't have all of the cost that we  
9 taxpayers absorb in terms of taxes, in terms of health  
10 impacts, in terms of damage to our environment, the fossil  
11 fuels would be much more expensive and investors would be  
12 going even more quickly to our clean, renewable energies.

13 Someone mentioned the cascadia subduction fault,  
14 and I just recently read the USGS report, the 2014 update  
15 that says the cascadia subduction zone the southern end of  
16 it, which is off of Coos Bay, eight miles, has a more  
17 frequent occurrence of high magnitude earthquakes every 250  
18 years rather than 500, and it's been over 300. So, please  
19 seriously look at the affects of Tsunami and earthquakes.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. The  
21 next speakers are Nancy Nelson, Bill Jennett, and Carl  
22 Lawrence.

23 MS. NELSON: Good evening. Our third person has  
24 already gone home, so we would like to also use her minutes,  
25 if we may. It got too later for her.

PM2-75  
continued

PM2-76

## PM2

## Continued, page 120 of 152

### PM2-76

Section 4.2 of the EIS discusses the CSZ, and analyzes potential impacts from related geological hazards, include earthquakes and tsunamis.

PM2

Continued, page 121 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

121

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: You have three minutes.

2 MS. NELSON: Okay. Thank you. My name is  
3 spelled N-a-n-c-y, N-e-l-s-o-n, and I'm here to speak on  
4 behalf of the Jackson County Fuel Committee because the  
5 people who are going to suffer from this pipeline are, of  
6 course, the poor, the low-income workers, students, the  
7 small business owners, and the concerned citizens, which  
8 you've heard from tonight, while the largest fossil fuel  
9 companies in the world continue to profit.

10 So, pushing a pipeline through Jackson County  
11 will certainly drive up our natural gas prices. The federal  
12 Department of Energy, you've already heard, has already  
13 reported, and this was two years ago in December 2012, that  
14 exporting natural gas is expected to increase domestic gas  
15 prices by 25 percent. Now, do you really think that wages  
16 are going to increase 25 percent after these temporary jobs  
17 are gone?

18 The poor, the low-income workers, the students  
19 they're already trying and struggling to get a \$15 minimum  
20 wage, so they are going to suffer. And just this last year  
21 there were 160 cases that the Jackson County Fuel Commission  
22 helped and fought with in order to stop the disconnection of  
23 their utility services. And these are elderly people,  
24 disabled people, and families with young children. Nine  
25 people died because of the cold and not having heat.

PM2

Continued, page 122 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 122

1 Now, we're talking about heat getting shut off in  
2 the winter because of this pipeline. And this year, the  
3 volunteers with the Jackson County Fuel Committee, we are  
4 absolutely opposed to this scheme. And four months ago  
5 there was a 35,000-acre fire that scorched Oregon.

6 This pipeline is considered Class 1; that means  
7 it will have the lowest level of standards. It will have  
8 thinner pipe. It will have gas running through it at higher  
9 pressure, and closer to the surface. There will be fewer  
10 safety patrols, and the requirement is at only 10 percent of  
11 the welds will be inspected. Ninety percent will not be  
12 inspected. The standard procedure is to check 100 percent  
13 of the welds. Natural gas leakage is highly destructive.  
14 Methane is 86 times worse --

15 MR. FREEMAN: It's time to wrap up.

16 MS. NELSON: -- in the greenhouse gas affect.  
17 And you have to look at a 70-year period.

18 MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next  
19 is Bill Jennett.

20 MR. JENNETT: My name is Bill Jennett. That's  
21 Bill J-e-n-n-e-t-t, and I'm a volunteer with Jackson County  
22 Fuel Committee.

23 And Nancy was just talking about the impact of  
24 methane, and this project's backers proudly predict that the  
25 pipeline will lead to even more fracking. A consultant for

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

123

PM2

Continued, page 123 of 152

1 Jordan Cove issued a report in March of 2012 that said LNG  
2 exports will be "instrumental in providing the increased  
3 demand to spur exploration and development of gas shale  
4 assets in North America."

5 And the LNG terminal could explode in an all-out  
6 catastrophe. Nancy spoke to the 35,000-acre Oregon Gulch  
7 fire which happened this last summer, which is right where  
8 they want to put the pipeline in, in Jackson in Klamath  
9 County. But the terminal itself will hold 80 million  
10 gallons of highly explosive liquid methane. It will be  
11 built sand above an earthquake zone that seismologist say is  
12 overdue for a major quake in the face of Tsunamis like the  
13 ones that caused the meltdown at Japan's Fukushima plant in  
14 2011.

15 If it were to explode, the impact would be on the  
16 scale of a nuclear bomb, minus the radiation, but FERC's  
17 environmental impact statement says the project's impacts  
18 could be mitigated to a "not significant level." True, no  
19 one lives within the mile-wide kill zone and the owners  
20 would not have to worry about rescuing their incinerated  
21 workers, but 17,000 people do live within the two-mile burn  
22 so. So, what's their plan to cope with 17,000 severe burn  
23 victims? Perhaps we should invite the owners to relocate  
24 their corporate headquarters to Coos Bay.

25 The amount of electricity that would be needed

PM2-77

PM2-77

See response to IND6-1. LNG is not "highly explosive," nor would impacts be similar to a nuclear bomb; read section 4.13 of the EIS. Impacts for an earthquake are discussed in section 4.2.

PM2

Continued, page 124 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

124

1 for the liquefaction plant is enough to provide for the  
2 needs of half a million people, but none that would be used  
3 to heat or power a single home. All the energy would be  
4 required just to liquefy the gas for export. We'd also end  
5 up paying \$200,000 in this state in the form of tax breaks  
6 and subsidies. The multinationals intend to get out of  
7 paying state taxes using a loophole known as enterprise  
8 zones.

9 Now, instead of building a huge infrastructure to  
10 sell off our natural resources, we need meet out energy  
11 needs by investing in human and natural resources right  
12 here. You could look at the example of Jackson County Fuel  
13 Committee. We use renewable biomasses southern Oregon has  
14 in abundance. According to the Co-Generation Project at  
15 Southern Oregon University, natural gas here costs three  
16 times as firewood to generate the same amount of  
17 electricity.

18 So, our approach is the direct opposite to what  
19 the fossil fuel industry is doing. Our volunteers  
20 weatherize homes, reducing their carbon footprint for  
21 heating by about 30 percent. We provide firewood free of  
22 charge, saving people about a hundred dollars a month on  
23 their winter heating bills. So, we're calling on you to  
24 stop the multinationals from using Oregon as a gateway for  
25 gas exports and take a major step in reducing carbon levels.

PM2

Continued, page 125 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

125

1 by blocking U.S. exports from the West Coast.

2 We demand that you stop this pipeline

3 immediately. Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next

5 is Carl Lorenz. After Carl is JoAnne Eggers and Gail

6 Carney. I need all of you to come to the front, please.

7 MR. LORENZ: Hello there. My name is Carl

8 Lorenz. That's C-a-r-l, L-o-r-e-n-z.

9 And just to know my thinking on this, my

10 grandfather was a U.S. Forest Service ranger at Fremont.

11 We've been debating land use in my family way before I was

12 born.

13 One of the things that almost mystify me is the

14 almost 95-foot swath of land that the pipe is laid on, and I

15 wonder -- and I will have to look this up in the document.

16 I'm sure it won't be that difficult to find.

17 Are they trying to prevent natural acidification

18 that occurs in the soils as plant materials rot and then

19 filter down through the soils and hit the rocks and changes,

20 you know, because that would probably one of the greater

21 dangers to the pipeline? And running the pipeline through

22 the natural forest where -- I'm just saying I don't think

23 natural acidification can be stopped in a natural forest.

24 If it could be stopped anywhere, you know, that would be the

25 most difficult place. I can't imagine that.

PM2

Continued, page 126 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

126

1           Anyway, pine needles and such being some of them  
2   are acidic, you know, acidifying ingredients of the forest.  
3   Just giving thought to that and other things that people  
4   have brought up, I do believe that elk migration would be  
5   radically affected by a 95-foot, you know, swath running  
6   through the forest. I believe the gentleman that brought  
7   that up had a very good point. It could influence deer and  
8   other large mammals, bears and such, I suppose, but elk  
9   would be the primary concern on that.

10           Desilicification of rivers, fracking itself, and  
11   the selling of methane like there's no tomorrow, and I'm  
12   concerned for the future of the world where all of the  
13   natural, you know, heat-producing compounds are mined in  
14   great quantities, sold to the best markets as fast as they  
15   can be sold, and that may not be the wisest use of our  
16   natural resources. So that is all I have to say.

17           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next  
18   is -- . Is Jim here? Then after is JoAnne Eggers.

19           MS. EGGERS: JoAnne Eggers, J-o-A-n-n-e,  
20   E-g-g-e-r-s.

21           Some of my friends, most of who are not here, who  
22   said this sort of thing to me said why are you bothering  
23   time to stop this pipeline and project. It's a done deal.  
24   And I chose to believe that we can have some affect, and  
25   that it's not a done deal, and I trust you to listen to us.

PM2

Continued, page 127 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

127

1 Thank you.

2 I fear that our young people and their children  
3 will not have a livable future if projects such as the  
4 Pacific Connector Pipeline and the LNG plant and export  
5 facility are built and put into use. As an older adult, I  
6 feel responsible to work for their future.

7 Addressing climate change is the top ethical and  
8 moral issue of our day. And I believe it is also a legal  
9 issue, stealing the possibility for a livable future,  
10 destroying the natural systems that support life constitute  
11 the highest of crimes. Water pollution from fracking and  
12 the planetary effects of climate change from facilitating  
13 the export and use of fossil fuel are an assault on life.

14 The longer we wait to phase out our fossil fuels  
15 the more devastating the impacts, the more costly in  
16 economic, social, environmental terms. The recent pipeline  
17 commercials on TV say boost southwest Oregon and it's our  
18 turn. They're a ruse. Oregon is not a third world country  
19 to be plundered and scarred for the benefit of big business.  
20 True boosting would be to protect our people, our forests,  
21 our streams, and our public and private lands and to develop  
22 green energy, which creates almost three times as many jobs  
23 for the money spent.

24 The proposed project does not serve the American  
25 people, only a few who would make money from it and leave



PM2

Continued, page 128 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 128

1 the rest of us a mess that would be impossible to clean up.  
2 If it's our turn for anything, it's to secure a livable  
3 future for those who come after us. That truly would be a  
4 public good.  
5 To paraphrase a quote you may be familiar with, I  
6 would say we don't have the time to fiddle with so-called  
7 transitional fossil fuels while Rome burns.  
8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Your  
9 name is not on the list. If you want your name on the list,  
10 I'll put it on there.  
11 MS. EGGERS: It was on the list. I was wondering  
12 why it took so long.  
13 MS. CARNEY: It's actually G-a-i-a, last name  
14 C-a-r-n-e-y. Thank you for your time and for being here. I  
15 have some prepared comments. I'll email them to you.  
16 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, you will not email them to me.  
17 MS. CARNEY: I'll print them and fax them.  
18 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, you will --  
19 MS. CARNEY: I'll send them by a pigeon.  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: You will either --  
21 MS. CARNEY: I'll put them on a train. I know, I  
22 know, I'll put them in a pipeline.  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Do you want your comments  
24 considered?  
25 MS. CARNEY: Yes, I do.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

129

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: You can give them to me right here  
2 today.

3 MS. CARNEY: Okay.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Or you can mail to the Commission  
5 at that address.

6 MS. CARNEY: Super.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Or to our website at www.FERC.gov  
8 and go to electronic filings where E-comment or E-filing.

9 MS. CARNEY: I'll look forward to doing all those  
10 things.

11 My family moved to Oregon in 1974. I've lived in  
12 Ashland since 1988. I do appreciate your time, and I take  
13 seriously your time.

14 I have many concerns for the negative impact of  
15 the Jordan Cove LNG pipeline on Oregon's economy, it's  
16 natural resources, and rural people. Another specific  
17 concern that I've heard echoed here today, but that I would  
18 like to articulate, is the lower rural safety standards and  
19 the lack of any credible plan by the parties involved should  
20 the pipeline or terminals fail.

PM2-78

21 As I saw, as we all saw to our horror in the Gulf  
22 of Mexico, the discovery of Horizon oil spill left the  
23 world's so-called experts on oil spills totally flat-footed.  
24 What plan to mitigate an LNG accident on a wetland or a  
25 river or like the Rogue or Oregon's public beaches, like

**PM2**

**Continued, page 129 of 152**

PM2-78

The DOT regulations pipeline design. Safety is addressed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

130

1 Fukushima in Japan, BP in the Gulf, and the Tennessee coal  
2 ash pond breach, and three LNG terminal explosions?  
3 The authorities that seek to assure us on the  
4 safety of the LNG pipeline have no credibility or reliable  
5 experience when it comes to actually cleaning up what would  
6 be an unmitigated natural disaster. It takes little imagine  
7 to foresee the horror of just one accident on just one of  
8 Oregon's precious natural areas, pristine rivers or  
9 world-class beaches.  
10 The lower safety standards in rural Oregon, which  
11 I find so offensive, I fear that future jobs may not be so  
12 temporary. Jordan Cove terminal and pipeline would provide  
13 all kinds of BP jobs I've seen in the Discovery Horizon  
14 spill. Hazardous chemical cleanup jobs they could be jobs  
15 with a real future in Oregon as long as the pipeline exists  
16 and continues to imperil Oregon farmland and rivers.  
17 I ask FERC to please extend the public comment  
18 period. Thank you. I ask FERC to please include northern  
19 Oregonians, as they would be impacted, and I think they  
20 should have the right to comment. And then, as far as I'm  
21 concerned, there's really only one way to protect Oregon  
22 from kind of unprecedented natural disasters with the  
23 pipeline is for there to be no pipeline and for there to be  
24 no terminal. And I appreciate your time and consideration  
25 today. Thank you.

PM2-79

**PM2**

**Continued, page 130 of 152**

PM2-79

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

131

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. So,  
2 next is Jay Mallard, the Bryan Sohl, and Renee Cote, and  
3 then Tom Letchworth. Is Jay Mallard here? Okay. And  
4 everyone else whose name I just called come on up here to be  
5 ready.

6 MR. MALLARD: Hello. Thanks for this  
7 opportunity. So much has already been addressed here that  
8 I'm really grateful for. I'll try to be as succinct as I  
9 can be.

10 Going on my 20 years experience in the industry,  
11 I have some serious concerns for the pipeline, whether  
12 they're being adequately addressed. I support the  
13 environmental concerns, in general, from most of the people  
14 here today.

15 My specific concerns are the federal standards up  
16 to the earthquake hazard up here that's been mentioned  
17 several times in terms of specifics of how often shutoff  
18 valves are going to be installed for if there was a major,  
19 catastrophic leak how would you protect the largest amount  
20 of people as possible? So, what are the federal standards  
21 for the distance between your shutoff valves? Do they have  
22 automatic control mechanisms that respond to the seismic  
23 upsets -- excuse me. I'm so nervous. It's coming through  
24 in my talking. That's one concern.

25 Also about fires, also about corrosion on the

PM2-80

---

**PM2**

**Continued, page 131 of 152**

---

PM2-80

Geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, are addressed in section 4.2 of the EIS. The DOT regulations pipeline design, including the distance between MLVs.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

132

1 pipeline, when cost-cutting measures are engaged there's --  
2 I've seen in industry for many, many years in refinery not  
3 adequate inspections puts the public at risk. So, there's  
4 several types of -- my basic question is there going to be  
5 adequate maintenance that will protect public safety. And  
6 I'm so nervous I can't talk any more. So, I had more to  
7 say, but I'll leave it at that.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next  
9 our speakers are Renee Cote and Tommy Letchworth.

10 MS. COTE: My name is Renee Cote, R-e-n-e-e,  
11 C-o-t-e. I'm speaking for the Oregon Women's Land Trust.  
12 I'm speaking for the land, 140 acres that will be destroyed  
13 by this pipeline.

14 We are opposed to this project for the many  
15 obvious reasons that have been brought up so clearly  
16 tonight. What I want to insist on is the lack of safety for  
17 the construction of this pipeline that has been allowed by  
18 FERC.

19 FERC has already decided, and this is on page  
20 4-986 of the DEIS. It has already decided to allow this  
21 greedy Canadian corporation -- and I know about Canadian  
22 corporation that are greedy because I'm Canadian -- and to  
23 allow this greedy Canadian corporation to save money by  
24 cutting safety precautions, to use thinner pipes, to use  
25 less welds, less inspection, and other cost-saving measures.

PM2-81

---

**PM2**

**Continued, page 132 of 152**

---

PM2-81

Pipe thickness and other pipeline safety standards are discussed in section 4.13.9.1 of the DEIS. These standards are set by the DOT, not by the FERC. No decision about this Project has been made by the Commission at this time.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

133

1 And this is unacceptable and that will be because of this  
2 Class 1 that's been already explained.  
3 But I would say that this is unacceptable the way  
4 way that it is unacceptable what happened tonight for the  
5 size of this room. I understand you said, okay, we'll have  
6 another chance next month, another meeting. This was a  
7 mistake. Now, I'm bringing now to the pipeline. And I'm  
8 saying -- I want to point out that for the landowners, for  
9 the people when this pipeline explode because of the safety  
10 measures that will be -- has been allowed for profit there  
11 will not be another chance.

12 Say no to this project. Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Tommy  
14 Letchworth.

15 MR. LETCHWORTH: Good evening. My name is Tommy  
16 Letchworth, L-e-t-c-h-w-o-r-t-h.

17 I've come here today to voice my opposition to  
18 the LNG pipeline. I have but one message I wish to relay  
19 this evening, and it is this, the seeds that we plant today  
20 will produce the fruit on which future generations will  
21 feed. It is our collective choice to determine what kind of  
22 fruit we provide them with. Will it be nutritious and  
23 beautiful or will it be poisonous and neglected?

24 Now, the pipeline and production facility will  
25 provide jobs, this is true, but for how long and at what

PM2-81  
continued

PM2-82

PM2

Continued, page 133 of 152

PM2-82

The economic benefits of the Project are described in section 4.9 of the EIS.

PM2

Continued, page 134 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

134

1 cost? We must ask ourselves what are we willing to  
2 sacrifice on this project's behalf.

3 Now, when economically viable alternatives are  
4 being made available in greater numbers every day, and I  
5 should know, I work in the renewable energy industry, is it  
6 truly wise to choose the path that leads to short-term gain  
7 and long-term cataclysm? Jobs are indeed a necessary  
8 resource, but jobs come and go.

9 Now, this evening we're considering whether or  
10 not to purchase short-term jobs for a community of  
11 Oregonians, but the currency with which this debt will be  
12 paid is invaluable for we will be paying with our children's  
13 futures, with the health of our people, with the  
14 contamination of our water, our soil, and the further  
15 disruption of our global climate. Now, this world is not  
16 ours to give. It is ours to borrow from our children. In  
17 what state will we return it to the generations to come?

18 Now, economic development and sustainable  
19 development are not mutually exclusive. For example, in  
20 Canada, Veresen's home country, more people are employed in  
21 the renewable energy industry than are employed in the  
22 booming tar sands industry that we will be feeding.

23 So, economic development and sustainable  
24 development are not mutually exclusive; however, know this,  
25 we can live without fossil fuels, but we cannot live without

PM2

Continued, page 135 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

135

1 clean water. Now, I know what we ask of you. We ask you to  
2 do what is right, not what is easy. We ask you to do what  
3 is just, not what is profitable. And you do not do these  
4 things the future generations will ask us, will ask you how  
5 could you allow yourselves to be bought for so cheap.

6 And on that note, one of my favorite members of  
7 the next generation has been waiting very patiently to go to  
8 bed on my behalf. So, thank you and have a wonderful night.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Julie  
10 Matthews, Donna Benjamin, Bryan Sohl, and Sam Miller. If  
11 you all would come to the front, be ready.

12 MS. MATTHEWS: Hi. Julie Matthews, spelled like  
13 it sounds with two T's, plural. Thank you for hearing us.

14 I want to bring up a voice from the past. In  
15 eighth grade civics class I memorized or I was told to  
16 memorize the first paragraph of the Declaration of  
17 Independence. I'd like to recite it now.

18 We hold these truths to be self-evident that all  
19 men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable  
20 rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit  
21 of happiness.

22 I could make some comments that maybe a few  
23 things need to be brought out about that paragraph, but  
24 before I do, the rest of the Declaration of Independence was  
25 about the people petitioning against the King of England



PM2

Continued, page 136 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

136

1 their grievances, and it's a long document. And I recommend  
2 reading at least the second paragraph, which I can't recite.

3 But this is a voice from the past, and a long  
4 past ago, but not so far in the past. And I think there's  
5 some hindsight since then, and I'd like us to not create  
6 another mess that we have regrettable hindsight for in the  
7 future.

8 I think this sort of an endeavor and undertaking,  
9 though our needs may be great, though China's needs may be  
10 great, though we may be in a rush to fix global climate  
11 change, we got ourselves there. We are responsible, and we  
12 need to take responsibility in responsible ways, not just a  
13 band aid fix that creates a worse mess.

14 So, I'd like us to listen to the voices of the  
15 past. I'd like us to listen to all the voices tonight, all  
16 of them. I don't think we're against each other, even the  
17 people who want jobs I have great compassion for. I think  
18 there has been a strategy in our world to break down our  
19 economy so that there aren't jobs for us so that we're  
20 desperate to take any job and be a puppet on a string for  
21 other agendas.

22 Now, the words in that paragraph, certain  
23 inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and  
24 the pursuit of happiness. Who are we pursuers of happiness?  
25 I think we've been focused on pursuing happiness way more

PM2

Continued, page 137 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

137

1 than life and liberty to the extent that it's exploiting  
2 life and liberty. And our environment is not expendable.  
3 It's sustains us, and we need to work with it in responsible  
4 ways.

5 So, I ask you to really serious look at this from  
6 the heart of this voice of truth. We hold these truths to  
7 be self evident that all men are created equal. That means  
8 humanity. That means all life. That means environmental  
9 life. That means life. And we did not create ourselves,  
10 and we did not create this planet, and we should be grateful  
11 for it and very thoughtful about our responsibilities.  
12 Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Donna  
14 Benjamin.

15 MS. BENJAMIN: Donna Benjamin, D-o-n-n-a,  
16 B-e-n-j-a-m-i-n.

17 The reason that I'm here tonight is because I was  
18 willing to go with a fight with my life for the tar sands.  
19 And I mentioned that to a friend. I was so upset that I was  
20 going to the Dakotas and fight for it. And she said, oh  
21 well, there's a meeting on Tuesday about the LNG here, and I  
22 said, oh my goodness. So, it's a little more convenient for  
23 me to be here, so not in my valley. That's how I felt, not  
24 in my valley, not on my watch.

25 So, I'm happy to go over the scientific things.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

138

1 We have the environmental impacts. Everybody spoke about  
2 all of that. I'm saying no to pursuing this pipeline, but I  
3 want to address what we want to say yes to. What do we want  
4 to say yes to?

5 Do we want to say yes to an extension for the  
6 people that are involved in this process, both on your end  
7 and our end, to research this more? Do we want to say yes  
8 to democracy in action, which would allow for an extension,  
9 or do we want to say yes to democracy inaction, not taking  
10 an action that the people that are really wanting to steward  
11 the land and steward this process that they don't have  
12 enough time to do it? Do we want to say yes to good land  
13 use, or land abuse?

14 Do we want to say yes to the next generation, oh  
15 yes, we did this pipeline because we felt it was really good  
16 for the economy, or do we want to say yes to the next  
17 generations and say we knew that this was going to hurt the  
18 land, the trees, the waters. We knew it was going to hurt  
19 the landowners. We knew that, but we said yes to it anyway.

20 So, there are lots and lots of questions about  
21 where and how we want to proceed here, and at what price.  
22 At what price? Is this progress? It is progress to know  
23 that something this important is in front of us and we said  
24 yes to something. And then I had heard that this eminent  
25 domain was one of the main reasons that this is going to

PM2-83

**PM2**

**Continued, page 138 of 152**

PM2-83

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

139

PM2

Continued, page 139 of 152

1 potentially go through. And then I heard that it was going  
2 to China. So, if this for the greater good of the people  
3 that are here, it didn't make any sense to me. And I'm not  
4 a professional or an expert on eminent domain.

PM2-83  
continued

5 So, with all due respect, I ask the people  
6 sitting here, the decision makers. And I have enormous  
7 compassion for people who don't have jobs, but those jobs  
8 will be at the price of the land, at the price of the trees,  
9 at the price of the waters, at the price of the health and  
10 well being of the people around them. Someone who didn't  
11 take care of the environmental impacts, and I have asthma as  
12 a result. Somebody was not there when I was a child making  
13 sure that those things didn't happen and they happened and  
14 my health is compromised for it.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Start to wrap it up please.

16 MS. BENJAMIN: Please let us not compromise the  
17 health of our future generations. Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. MR. SOHL: Thank  
19 you. My name is Bryan with a "Y," Sohl, S-o-h-l.

20 And I have to really ask what is the benefit of  
21 this project for my children and grandchildren and in the  
22 next generation, and I don't see it? I'm concerned about  
23 any environmental impact statement that does not include the  
24 environmental cost of fracking. I don't consider that to be  
25 an honest environmental impact statement.

PM2-84

PM2-84

See response to IND6-1.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

140

1 I don't feel, for my kids' sake, that replacing  
2 one fossil fuel with another will be of their benefit. I've  
3 been a physician in Medford since 1988. Union members such  
4 as ironworkers, electricians, pipefitters, plumbers,  
5 steamfitters, they've fed my family. They butter my bread.  
6 They pay my salary, and I'm very grateful; but so do river  
7 guides and ski instructors, fishing guides, and farmers,  
8 those whose jobs will be at risk with climate change.

9 I feel we can't continue to kick the climate can  
10 down the road any longer. We must not in our own backyard  
11 facilitate the building of more fossil fuel infrastructure.  
12 And we need to find the political will to develop a new  
13 clean energy environment, one that our union friends will  
14 build.

15 I urge you to do what you can to stop the program  
16 and to extend the public comment period. Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

18 MS. HALL: Hi. My name is Vera Hall, and I'm a  
19 resident of Medford, Oregon. I'm here on behalf of myself,  
20 and I'm also an advocate attendee of Occupy Medford  
21 meetings. And I wish to voice my concern about how this  
22 project may be destructive in more ways than one, and I am  
23 not just talking about the physical and the literal details  
24 of our physical reality here.

25 I have always been more of a philosophical

PM2

Continued, page 140 of 152

PM2-85

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

PM2-85

PM2

Continued, page 141 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

141

1 personality, and I am circumspect of any claims that  
2 potentially hazards projects can be handled without untoward  
3 consequences. I was 18 years old more than two decades ago  
4 when I first questioned my mother's economic investments in  
5 nuclear energy, and she insisted they can be handled  
6 responsibly.

7 Two decades later, I feel a little betrayed  
8 looking at the Hanford nuclear disaster that happened. I  
9 think it was 2008/2009. There was a leaky container that  
10 was double barreled and -- which is one thing with having a  
11 problem, but then to cover up after the cover up after a  
12 cover up I have to be deluded not to call that deception.

13 Anyhow, I'd like to take a moment to recognize a  
14 documentary I found very informative called "Gasland II,"  
15 and I would like to inform you and tell you that for me this  
16 was destructive in more ways than just physical. It was  
17 destructive to the First Amendment rights. I'd like to show  
18 you a picture of this man. And I'm sorry, his name had  
19 every letter of the alphabet in it, and I can't remember his  
20 name; but he built his dream home and had to move out of it  
21 because it was not safe to live there. He was the one -- he  
22 had the test done and they warned him to move or else the  
23 house could blow up because the water was contaminated and  
24 he was not getting honest answers from the global  
25 corporations that were running tests. And it shows a

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

142

1 picture of him being able to light his own water on fire.  
2 And who did the documentary I'd like to show you  
3 -- this picture is a picture of him being apprehended after  
4 attempting to film -- let's see I think it was the EPA was  
5 going up against some people in Congress -- I'm sorry. I'm  
6 not real specific on the real details, but they were trying  
7 to discuss some adverse affects of fracking on people's  
8 homes and he was apprehended for refusing to take his camera  
9 out of the courtroom for that meeting.  
10 And the person who ordered that camera to be  
11 removed was this man here by name of Andy Harris, who was  
12 the Congress chairman of the committee that day.  
13 So, I know I'm in a reality of a very physical  
14 reality where the sun doesn't always shine and the wind  
15 doesn't always blow, but I also know it's a reality where  
16 any mention of Wilhelm Reich or Nikola Tesla has been  
17 omitted from my history books growing up. I'd never heard  
18 of them until I turned 43.  
19 And I would like to say that I'm at a point now  
20 I'm a standing point, personally, we can either create or we  
21 can be destructive, creation or destruction, and I stand on  
22 the side of creation. We need to work with creation and not  
23 try to dominate the --  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: You need to close now.  
25 MS. HALL: I'm concluding. I'm closing. And

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

143

1 creation or destruction, and I would rather be on the side  
2 of creation. I cannot imagine any reason why anyone would  
3 want to serve two masters, creation or destruction. If you  
4 try to serve two masters that is very --

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

6 MS. HALL: Thank you for this opportunity to  
7 speak. Goodbye.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gary Jackson.

9 MR. JACKSON: Good evening. I'm Gary Jackson,  
10 the business agent for the International Laborers Union,  
11 Local 296, up here in Medford. And thank you for this  
12 opportunity to speak here tonight.

13 Although this pipeline is owned by a Canadian  
14 firm, not all the gas is going to be exported as a lot of  
15 people are thinking. Some of this gas is going to actually  
16 be coming right here in Grants Pass. There's a line that it  
17 is looking into right back in Grants Pass.

18 There's also provisions for other lateral lines  
19 that can provide future employment and different types of  
20 manufacturing. All people have to do is get on the  
21 bandwagon with us and go after it, and those will provide  
22 long-term, steady jobs for the local economy here.

23 At its peak employment on this pipeline and on  
24 the Jordan Cove Project itself, at Jordan Cove there'd be  
25 2100 people working at Coos Bay and about another 1400 will



20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

144

1 be employed on the pipeline. And yes, these are what come  
2 consider short-term jobs. We work two to four years. For a  
3 construction worker, like ourselves, that's a long-term job.

4 Then there will be approximately 150 full-time  
5 employees after this project is completed with another 700  
6 jobs, which will be indirect jobs, such as restaurant jobs,  
7 store jobs, extra help in those stores and restaurants.  
8 There's also going to be 50 jobs, which include public  
9 safety people and tugboat operators, and that type of thing,  
10 which will be paid for by the people of Jordan Cove. So,  
11 that's what, close to 900 jobs that's going to be created  
12 from this pipeline.

13 And FERC has established guidelines and mandates  
14 that the Jordan Cove people and the pipeline people have to  
15 meet in order to get this permit. If they meet those  
16 guidelines, I don't see why they shouldn't be issued this  
17 permit. And I would encourage you to do that.

18 Also, I would encourage you not to grant any  
19 extensions to this process. Thank you.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

21 MS. HARMAN: It's Johanna, J-o-h-a-n-n-a,  
22 H-a-r-m-a-n. I'm from Talent, Oregon. And I didn't have  
23 anything prepared. It's so important for me that I got  
24 paralyzed with not knowing what to say. So, what I will  
25 submit the details. I just wanted to speak generally just

PM2-86

PM2

Continued, page 144 of 152

PM2-86

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

145

1 to say, you know, number one, yes, we need an extension.  
2 This is a holiday and it's not enough time, so please extend  
3 to 120 days.

4 And you know, Washington has rejected this  
5 pipeline. California has rejected this pipeline, and the  
6 blue state of Oregon needs to reject this pipeline. And the  
7 reasons -- well, I just want to talk -- I'm concerned about  
8 habitat fragmentation, and I'm concerned about the clear-cut  
9 on the streams. I work with Friends of Wagner Creek and I  
10 just started learning this stuff. What I learned is that  
11 streams, the habitat fish, Coho, required 64 degrees and  
12 less in order to keep the ecosystem at -- the creatures that  
13 this network, this system requires this temperature.

14 There have been problems with temperature and  
15 millions of dollars has gone into restoring the temperature  
16 of these streams. And so I don't understand how 95-foot  
17 clear-cuts on the edge of streams -- you know, the  
18 investment of millions of dollars that are going into it.  
19 I'm looking at our little creek that we're working on and  
20 what it's going to take to just get the native foliage so  
21 that the -- so, you know. Okay, so that's one.

22 The purpose of this project is to increase  
23 fracking. Fracking is not adequately covered in the -- now  
24 I've read the nine-page -- I read the executive summary. I  
25 haven't read the 5,000 pages, but fracking is a serious,

PM2-87

PM2

Continued, page 145 of 152

PM2-87

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015. The states of Washington and California have not rejected this pipeline, because the pipeline was never proposed in those other states. Also, only the FERC, and not any state, can authorize a jurisdictional interstate natural gas transmission pipeline. Impacts on waterbodies are addressed in section 4.4 of the EIS. See response to IND1-3.

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

146

PM2

Continued, page 146 of 152

1 serious issue. I've heard it referred to -- I've been  
2 following it for two years. And I have friends in  
3 Pennsylvania and different and it -- I've heard it referred  
4 to as antidotes. There are -- okay, so the report has to  
5 address fracking because fracking is a huge issue, the  
6 health reports that are coming out and then -- that's all  
7 right.

PM2-88

8 The emission it's not just coal. Methane is a  
9 very destructive emission, and there's a lot of studies  
10 coming out where the EPA as measured incorrectly and there's  
11 studies from Stanford. There are studies from Harvard. And  
12 NASA has seen the methane leaks from these, so I will put  
13 this -- organize this for you. Sorry. I just wanted to  
14 register my opposition; you know my clear opposition to this  
15 project for numerous reasons.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

17 MS. HARMAN: Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: That was the last speaker on our  
19 list. We have more. Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You skipped one -- .

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I did not. I read that name  
22 and no one came up. Jim McGinnis come on up.

23 MR. MCGINNIS: Thank you for the opportunity to  
24 talk tonight.

25 So many people have said so many things that I

PM2-88

See response to IND6-1.

PM2

Continued, page 147 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

147

1 would like to say, I just want to say a couple of things. I  
2 listen to Steven Chu. You know who he is. He was the  
3 former Secretary of Energy for the first term of the Obama  
4 Administration. He gave a talk at Stanford this June. I  
5 was really blown away by a couple of the things that he  
6 said. One of which -- I worked on the climate change issues  
7 for years, since 2006, trained by Al Gore, and I've given  
8 many, many presentations and I've talked to a lot of -- not  
9 officially in this capacity right now with the Forest  
10 Service.

11 I worked with sustainable operations and climate  
12 change, so I know a lot about what's happening in the world  
13 today. And I just want to speak to a couple of things, and  
14 I'd like to ask you guys, and for your group to please look  
15 at Steven Chu's 45-minute talk.

16 One of the things he says is that we have enough  
17 fossil fuel now due to the availability -- mainly because of  
18 fracking around the world to give us more fossil fuel than  
19 we can use through 2100, okay. So, that's just kind of a  
20 fact.

21 And he says that within 10 years we will have  
22 renewable energy -- the cost of renewable energy will be  
23 lower than the cost of fossil fuel. So, to address the  
24 environmental, economic, and social impacts of this I think  
25 that there's some really important things to consider, the

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

148

1 long-term impacts, the upstream impacts of fracking and that  
2 type of thing, the downstream impacts on climate change.

3 So, I believe that in what little I've read, and  
4 I plan on reading more, about the DEIS that really think  
5 it's important to do a better job of looking at the  
6 upstream, cradle-to-cradle thinking, upstream costs and the  
7 downstream impacts of this effort.

8 I really support the boilermakers and others who  
9 have jobs and they need to keep them in Oregon and they need  
10 to keep them locally. I think there are jobs that are to be  
11 had, and we should be looking at that. Thank you very much.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. The  
13 next two speakers are Jim Wilson and Ryan Navickas. So, if  
14 those two people could come to the front and be ready.

15 MR. WILSON: My name is Jim Wilson, J-i-m,  
16 W-i-l-s-o-n.

17 I'm a third generation Oregonian, and my  
18 grandparents moved in here in the late twenties. I'm a  
19 property owner of just under a hundred acres, so I know what  
20 the landowners are talking about, but I also am aware of the  
21 different situations when you start talking about  
22 right-of-ways. Almost every piece of land has right-of-ways  
23 going across it, whether it be the power lines going across  
24 your property, which you have to allow the neighbors to have  
25 access. We also have the right-of-ways for the phone, the

PM2-89

PM2

Continued, page 148 of 152

PM2-89

Section 1.4.4 of the DEIS explains why we did not consider upstream and downstream impacts; they are out-of-scope for this Project.

PM2

Continued, page 149 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

149

1 cable, the low-volume gas lines that are going into every  
2 home pretty much in this valley.  
3 As I was listening to a lot of these speakers  
4 this evening, I just jotted down some of the things I'd like  
5 to just kind of comment about. One of them is about all the  
6 trees and the things that are going to be wasted or removed.  
7 We see that every day. I drive throughout the State of  
8 Oregon quite a bit. I drive through Highway 97. They're  
9 clear-cutting 97 on both sides to make it so that the  
10 animals, I guess, have the ability not to get hit because of  
11 the closeness that the trees were to the road, but they're  
12 clear-cutting those trees.  
13 We just clear-cut because we just widened I-5 in  
14 two or three different places going up to -- up north. We  
15 clear-cut all of those trees off of their. They're  
16 clear-cutting trees along I-5 from the new extension of the  
17 freeway all the way through. So, as far as the land and the  
18 fact that the trees are getting cut, they're getting cut.  
19 It doesn't matter whether there's going to be a pipeline or  
20 not.  
21 The other thing that was talked about is putting  
22 the pipe underneath the river. Right now there already are  
23 some pipes and lines underneath the railroad. The thing  
24 that is interesting, though, we put bridges -- I am a  
25 construction worker, third generation construction worker,

PM2

Continued, page 150 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 150

1 and I've been around it my whole life. And the thing I also  
2 noticed is throughout the years we have always upgraded the  
3 skills and the ability to protect our lands every time that  
4 we turn around.

5 If you drive by any bridge, you know that there's  
6 barriers that they put up to retain the land so that it  
7 doesn't get into the waterways. We do protect our  
8 waterways, and we do protect the fish. We're not allowed to  
9 build bridges during the time that the salmon are running up  
10 and down the river. That's just the law. We have people  
11 that have to -- open opportunity to be able to work at those  
12 times. We show that again. The Forest Service is aware of  
13 those situations.

14 So, one of the things that the people talked  
15 about I know that they're probably dear to their heart, but  
16 a lot of it is also misleading. And I believe that there's  
17 some facts that need to be presented along with all the  
18 other information. Thank you.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
20 Ryan.

21 MR. NAVICKAS: Thanks. My name is Ryan Navickas.  
22 That's N-a-v-i-c-k-a-s.

23 So, let's see, Ryan Navickas. I'm a farmer. And  
24 I just want everybody to know I'm a working person. I don't  
25 collect a trust fund or anything like that.

PM2

Continued, page 151 of 152

20150113-4006 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

151

1           You know, I understand that we need all kinds of  
2 people to get by in this world, construction and logging and  
3 so -- but I just want to let everybody know that I'm a  
4 working person. I'm not a union member, but I kind of want  
5 to reiterate the -- with respect to the union workers here a  
6 point that's sort of already been made, but the labor  
7 movement in America has been fighting the outsourcing of  
8 jobs facilitated by agreements like NAFTA and DFTAA, the  
9 Pacific Trade Partners.

10           These sorts of agreements have been catastrophic  
11 for the unions and workers across the country. Thousands of  
12 jobs have left to go overseas. And I understand the reasons  
13 that the pipefitters unions are supporting these projects,  
14 this project, and pipefitter unions are also supporting  
15 solar thermal construction projects in the Southwest that  
16 also have the potential to employ many, many pipefitters.

17           And the difference between solar thermal projects  
18 and this export pipeline is that this project facilitates  
19 the export of gas and the outsourcing of jobs to non-union  
20 manufacturers in Asia, undermining the goals of the larger  
21 labor movement in America.

22           So, there's a great deal of work to be had here  
23 upgrading the leaking natural gas infrastructure in America.  
24 There's a source of significant methane pollution. And  
25 also, in solar thermal construction projects as well as



PM2

Continued, page 152 of 152

20150113-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

152

1 pipefitting sort of oriented things, and I'm not certainly  
2 willing to stand with pipefitters to get funding for these  
3 kinds of projects that are really badly needed and could  
4 provide a lot of jobs.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

6 So, Ryan was the last person on our speakers'  
7 list.

8 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
9 Commission and our federal cooperating agency partners, I  
10 would like to thank you for coming here tonight and  
11 providing us with your comments on our DEIS for the Jordan  
12 Cove Pacific Connector Project.

13 Let the record show that this meeting ended at  
14 10:00 p.m. Thank you very much.

15 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1

PM3

PM3

Public Meeting, Southwest Oregon Community College,  
December 8, 2014

1                               BEFORE THE  
2                               FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
3    - - - - - x  
4    IN THE MATTER OF:                               : Project No.  
5    JORDAN COVE - PACIFIC CONNECTOR               : CP13-483-000  
6    PIPELINE PROJECT                               : CP13-492-000  
7    - - - - - x  
8  
9                               Southwest Oregon Community College  
10                               1988 Newmark Ave.  
11                               Coos Bay, OR 97420  
12  
13                               Monday, December 8, 2014  
14                               The above-entitled matter came on for technical  
15    conference, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Paul Friedman,  
16    the moderator.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

2

PM3

Continued, page 2 of 187

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. At this time I need  
3 all the people in the aisles to come and take a seat. And I  
4 see lots of empty seats in the middle here. There are seats  
5 in the front. You can have a front row seat tonight.

6 So the reason we want the aisles clear is  
7 obvious: It might be a safety hazard, plus we want everyone  
8 to be able to walk up and down the aisles to get access to  
9 the microphones.

10 So everyone standing in the aisle, please find a  
11 seat in the middle of the auditorium, please.

12 Good evening. On behalf of the Federal Energy  
13 Regulatory Commission, which I will abbreviate either as  
14 FERC -- F-E-R-C -- or sometimes I'll just call it the  
15 Commission -- and our federal cooperating agency partners,  
16 I'd like to welcome you all here tonight to a public meeting  
17 to take comments on the draft environmental impact statement  
18 -- or I abbreviate that DEIS -- issued on November 7, 2014  
19 by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the Jordan  
20 Cove Liquefaction Pacific Connector Pipeline Project, which  
21 I will often just call the project.

22 My name is Paul Friedman, and I'm the FERC  
23 Environmental Project Manager for this particular project.

24 Also here with me tonight from FERC -- all the  
25 way from Washington, D.C. -- is Steve Busch -- he's the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

3

PM3

Continued, page 3 of 187

1 Assistant Project Manager; from the U.S. Department of  
2 Agriculture Forest Service is Wes Yamamoto. He's in the  
3 uniform on the end of the dais here.  
4 Representing the U.S. Department of the Interior  
5 Bureau of Land Management, which we like to abbreviate as  
6 the BLM, is Miriam Liberatore. She works out of the Medford  
7 office.  
8 Assisting us is my third-party contractor. It's  
9 a company called Tetra Tech. And they are the people who  
10 signed you up in the back. And working for me tonight I  
11 have John Scott, John Crookston, and Aaron King.  
12 And again I'm going to ask everyone in the aisle  
13 in the back to please come and take a seat. All right?  
14 Please do that for me now.  
15 (Pause.)  
16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Likewise, the BLM and the Forest  
17 Service have a contractor working for them here tonight.  
18 And that's North State Resources, represented by Paul  
19 Uncapher.  
20 So let the record show that this meeting began at  
21 6:00 p.m. on Monday, December 8, 2014 at the Southwest  
22 Oregon Community College in Coos Bay, Oregon.  
23 As -- Well, you can't see. But up there I have a  
24 court reporter. And so everything that happens tonight will  
25 be recorded by him on behalf of FERC so there will be

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

4

PM3

Continued, page 4 of 187

1 accurate notes on tonight's proceedings.

2 The court reporter is an employee of Ace-Federal  
3 Reporters; it's an independent contractor with the FERC.

4 And Ace will sell you copies of the transcript at various  
5 sliding scale prices bidding from sale day to five business  
6 days after this meeting. At some point Ace will provide the  
7 FERC with a copy of the transcript and I will put it in the  
8 public record so that everyone can have access to it through  
9 eLibrary.

10 And I have just been joined by the captain of the  
11 port, is that correct?

12 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Yes.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dave Travers, is that correct?

14 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Dan Travers.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dan Travers. I'm sorry. So,  
16 Captain Travers, welcome.

17 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: If you'd like to speak at  
19 tonight's meeting please sign the speakers' list at the back  
20 of the room maintained by my Tetra Tech team. And we will  
21 call people up to speak one at a time in the order in which  
22 you appear on the list. We ask you to print your name  
23 legibly so I can read it.

24 The production of the DEIS was a collaborative  
25 effort involving a number of federal cooperating agencies,

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

5

PM3

Continued, page 5 of 187

1 including the BLM, Forest Service, U.S. Army Corps of  
2 Engineers -- which I like to abbreviate as the COE -- the  
3 U.S. Department of Energy -- or DOE -- the U.S.  
4 Environmental Protection Agency -- we call that the EPA.  
5 It's like all these abbreviations. U.S. Department of  
6 Homeland Security, Coast Guard, the U.S. Department of the  
7 Interior Fish & Wildlife Service -- or FWS -- the Bureau of  
8 Reclamation -- which we call Reclamation -- and the Pipeline  
9 and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of the U.S.  
10 Department of Transportation.

11 The cooperating agencies had an opportunity to  
12 review an administrative draft, and some agencies  
13 contributed text to the DEIS. For example, the BLM and the  
14 Forest Service and the third-party contractor wrote sections  
15 of the DEIS related to their evaluation of proposed  
16 amendments to their individual district or National Forest  
17 land Management Plans to make provision for the Pacific  
18 Connector Pipeline.

19 In a few minutes the BLM representative and  
20 Forest Service representative will explain the actions that  
21 were taken by their agencies with regard to this project.

22 I'd like to thank our federal cooperating  
23 agencies for their participation in this environmental  
24 review process.

25 The FERC is an independent federal agencies that

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

6

PM3

Continued, page 6 of 187

1 regulates, among other things, the interstate transportation  
2 of natural gas. We were originally called the Federal Power  
3 Commission when we were created in 1920. And we were  
4 re-named and re-organized under the Carter administration.

5       The Commissioners, who are the decisionmakers,  
6 are individuals appointed by the President of the United  
7 States and confirmed by Congress. Usually there are five  
8 Commissioners, three from the party in power, which would  
9 mean currently three Democrats, and two from the other  
10 party, which means there are two Republicans. They  
11 typically serve five-year terms.

12       Steve and I are not appointed by the President.  
13 We are mere civil servants.

14       The FERC has approximately 1500 employees. So  
15 compared to many federal agencies we're relatively small.  
16 But I think we have important work to do in providing energy  
17 to the country.

18       The Commissioners take recommendations from staff  
19 prior to making decisions. Our recommendations for this  
20 project can be found in Section 5.2 of the DEIS.

21       In accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005  
22 and the Natural Gas Act, the FERC is the lead federal agency  
23 responsible for authorizing on-shore liquefied natural gas  
24 terminals -- or LNG terminals -- and interstate natural gas  
25 transmission facilities. We are also the lead agency for

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

7

PM3

Continued, page 7 of 187

1 compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of  
2 1969 -- also known as NEPA.

3 Our DEIS was prepared to satisfy the Council on  
4 Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the  
5 NEPA. The federal cooperating agencies can adopt our EIS  
6 for their regulatory needs and to comply with the NEPA.  
7 However, each agency would present their own independent  
8 conclusions in their respective records of decision.

9 The FERC record of decision would be in the form  
10 of a Commission order, which is issued only after the FEIS  
11 -- or the Final Environmental Impact Statement -- has been  
12 produced. So so far we have not made a decision about this  
13 project.

14 On May 21st, 2013, Jordan Cove Energy Project, LP  
15 -- which we just call Jordan Cove -- filed an application  
16 with the FERC under Section 3 of the NGA in docket number  
17 CP13-483-000, seeking authority to construct and operate an  
18 LNG export terminal in Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon.

19 Jordan Cove intends to produce about six million  
20 metric tons per annum of LNG from a supply of almost one  
21 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day for shipment in  
22 third-party vessels to customers around the Pacific Rim.  
23 Jordan Cove already has permission from the Department of  
24 Energy to export to both Free Trade Agreement nations and  
25 non-Free Trade Agreement nations.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

8

PM3

Continued, page 8 of 187

1           The main facilities to be part of the Jordan Cove  
2   complex includes a 220 megawatt power plant, a natural gas  
3   processing plant, four liquefaction trains, two LNG storage  
4   tanks, transfer pipeline and loading platform, a marine slip  
5   with docks for an LNG vessel and tugboats, and an access  
6   channel connecting their slip with the existing Coos Bay  
7   navigation channel.

8           Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline LP -- or Pacific  
9   Connector -- filed its application with the FERC in Docket  
10   Number CP13-492-000 under Section 7 of the NGA on June 6,  
11   2013. Pacific Connector seeks authority to construct and  
12   operate 232-mile long 36-inch diameter underground welded  
13   steel transmission pipeline between the mainland hub and the  
14   Jordan Cove terminal at Coos Bay.

15          The pipeline route would cross portions of  
16   Klamath, Jackson, Douglas, and Coos Counties, Oregon. Near  
17   Malin, Pacific Connector would connect with existing  
18   pipeline systems for Gas Transmission Northwest -- which we  
19   call GTN -- and the Ruby Pipeline -- which we just call Ruby  
20   -- to obtain natural gas produced in western Canada and the  
21   Rocky Mountains.

22          For full disclosure, Ruby is partly owned by one  
23   of the partners in both Pacific Connector and Jordan Cove.

24          GTN is owned by a company called TransCanada.

25          The Pacific Connector Pipeline would have a

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

9

PM3

Continued, page 9 of 187

1 design capacity of 1.07 billion cubic feet per day with  
2 about 1.04 bcf per day dedicated to delivery to the existing  
3 Northwest Pipeline Grant's Pass lateral to serve customers  
4 in Oregon.

5 Again for clarification, Northwest is owned by  
6 one of the partners of Pacific Connector.

7 Other facilities associated with the Pacific  
8 Connector Pipeline include a 41,000 horsepower compressor  
9 station near Malin, two receipt meter stations for GTN and  
10 Ruby within the compressor station tract, the Clarks Branch  
11 meter station at the interconnection with Northwest, a  
12 delivery meter station at the interconnection with Jordan  
13 Cove, five pig launchers and receivers, 17 mainline valves,  
14 and 11 communication towers.

15 Jordan Cove would receive its supply of natural  
16 gas from the Pacific Connector Pipeline. Therefore, we  
17 consider the two separate applications to be connected  
18 actions and evaluated the environmental impacts of both the  
19 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector proposals together in one  
20 comprehensive DEIS.

21 The two companies also share some ownership  
22 overlap.

23 I want to make it very clear that the project is  
24 being proposed by Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector, which  
25 are private companies. It is not something advocated by the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

10

PM3

Continued, page 10 of 187

1 United States government. The companies came up with the  
2 design and location for their facilities, and the FERC  
3 analyzed the environmental impacts associated with the  
4 construction and operation of those facilities in our DEIS.

5 The FERC is not an advocate for the project. We  
6 are advocates for the environmental review process.

7 The Commissioners will make their own independent  
8 decision about whether the proposed project has benefits and  
9 would be in the public interest. But they won't reveal that  
10 decision until later in the process.

11 During our review of the project we assembled  
12 information from a variety of sources, including the  
13 applications from the companies, data responses from the  
14 companies, public input, data provided by other federal,  
15 state and local resource agencies, and our own research.  
16 Our analysis can be found in the DEIS.

17 Once again, I'm going to ask everyone in the  
18 aisles to please find a seat. I see lots of seats in the  
19 middle.

20 So can everyone who are at the ends please move  
21 in towards the middle so everyone in the aisles can take a  
22 seat? I appreciate that.

23 We sent copies of our DEIS out to our  
24 environmental mailing list, which includes elected  
25 officials, federal, state and local agencies, regional

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

11

PM3

Continued, page 11 of 187

1 environmental groups and non-governmental organizations,  
2 affected land-owners, Indian Tribes, commenters, and other  
3 interested parties, local newspapers and libraries, and  
4 parties to the proceeding.

5 Paper copies were also sent to those who  
6 requested them in response to our Notice of Intent -- or  
7 NOI. So if you got a CD and not a paper copy it's because  
8 you didn't request a paper copy when you had that  
9 opportunity.

10 Everyone who received a copy of the DEIS will  
11 also be sent a copy of the Final Environmental Impact  
12 Statement. And you do not have to sign up again.

13 However, if last time you got a CD and next time  
14 you want a hard copy, all you have to do is to up to the  
15 back and sign up with John Scott and my Tetra Tech team, and  
16 you can put your name on the environmental mailing list and  
17 indicate that you want a hard copy. And we'll honor your  
18 request.

19 You can also use that list -- Okay. That's...

20 At this time we have no more hard copies of the  
21 DEIS. We actually only printed the amount that had been  
22 requested.

23 The Jordan Cove project includes LNG vessel  
24 marine traffic in the waterway to and from the terminal.  
25 Here at the Coos Bay meeting to discuss the impacts of the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

12

PM3

Continued, page 12 of 187

1 LNG vessel traffic in Coos Bay navigation channel is the  
2 Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Captain Dan Travers.  
3 (Applause.)  
4 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Thanks, everybody.  
5 Can you hear me? All right. This is live.  
6 Good. All right.  
7 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. As  
8 previously introduced, I am obviously Captain Dan Travers.  
9 I'm the Coast Guard Captain of the port for the Federal  
10 Maritime Security Coordinator for the center Columbia River.  
11 My area of responsibility reaches from Queets  
12 River up in -- near Puget Sound, all the way to the  
13 California border, and inland through southern Idaho to the  
14 Idaho-Utah border.  
15 I am here to discuss the Coast Guard role in  
16 assessing the proposed Jordan Cove LNG project on the north  
17 spit of Coos Bay.  
18 With me tonight are my project officers for this  
19 project, Mr. Russ Berg and Mr. Ken Lawrenson. I know  
20 they're out here because I walked in here with them. But  
21 I'm not sure -- Oh, here they are. Right here.  
22 And then Lieutenant Commander Chris Culpepper  
23 from Sector North M was supposed to be here also. I don't  
24 see Chris. He should hopefully be here in a little bit.  
25 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER CULPEPPER: All the way in

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

13

PM3

Continued, page 13 of 187

1 the back, Captain.

2 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: All right. Well, there we go.

3 Thank you.

4 A project such as Jordan Cove can be divisive.

5 I'll take a moment to clearly note the Coast Guard is

6 neutral as to whether or not this facility gets built.

7 It is my job to manage the navigable waterways

8 and ensure that they are safe and secure for all

9 recreational and commercial users.

10 The Jordan Cove project is one of two LNG

11 projects located within my area of responsibility. The

12 other proposal is for the entrance to the Columbia River in

13 Warrenton.

14 I exercise regulatory authority for waterfront

15 LNG facilities and associated vessel traffic under several

16 well established statutes, such as the Ports and Waterways

17 Safety Act, the Magnuson Act, the Maritime Transportation

18 Security Act, and others. FERC is the sole siting authority

19 for shore side LNG facilities.

20 The Coast Guard does not issue a permit for

21 siting or operation of LNG terminals. If the facility does

22 become established and operational the Coast Guard reviews

23 and approves the facilities operational manual, the facility

24 security plan, and emergency response plan.

25 For the purposes of FERC's permitting process the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

14

PM3

Continued, page 14 of 187

1 Coast Guard acts as a cooperating agency. We provide FERC  
2 with information relative to navigation, waterway safety and  
3 security, and vessel equipment.

4 The Coast Guard also requires the applicant to  
5 prepare and submit a waterway suitability assessment. We  
6 evaluate grounds through this assessment with subcommittee  
7 of the area Maritime Security Committee, consisting of  
8 industry experts and other stakeholders, including state and  
9 local emergency responders, marine pilots, towing industry  
10 representatives, and members of the Harbor Safety Committee.

11 This review culminates in a recommendation to  
12 FERC on the suitability of the waterway for LNG marine  
13 traffic.

14 One of my predecessors, Captain Fred Meyer,  
15 signed a letter of recommendation to FERC in April of 2009.  
16 That letter found the waterway could be made suitable for  
17 LNG traffic with implementation of certain risk mitigation  
18 measures as found in the Waterway Suitability Report of  
19 2008.

20 These documents remain the working documents for  
21 the Coast Guard in this project.

22 Although the Coast Guard's recommendation was  
23 submitted five years ago, we required and conducted annual  
24 reviews of the Water Suitability Assessment. Through these  
25 reviews we determined there are no significant changes to

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

15

PM3

Continued, page 15 of 187

1 the waterway or risks associated with LNG shipments since  
2 those documents were created.

3 Although the project has changed from import to  
4 export, the risks associated with the vessel in the waterway  
5 remained unchanged.

6 I am here tonight to listen to your comments.  
7 After I discuss your comments with my staff, the Coast Guard  
8 will respond to all comments in the Final environmental  
9 Impact Statement that will be prepared by FERC.

10 There have been some inaccurate reports and  
11 letters in the press which indicate the Coast Guard intends  
12 to shut recreational and commercial use of Coos Bay down  
13 during an LNG tanker transit. We have no intention to close  
14 the waterway during LNG shipments.

15 The Coast Guard is highly experienced managing  
16 similar moving safety and security zones in the Columbia  
17 River for cruise ships and shipments of other dangerous  
18 cargo such as anhydrous ammonia. We do recognize, however,  
19 that it is possible that fishing vessels departing  
20 Charleston during an LNG vessel transit may be delayed by 20  
21 to 40 minutes while the LNG tanker clears the entrance.

22 We take your comments seriously. And the more  
23 specific and detailed your comments are, the more thoroughly  
24 we can analyze and address them. Please take the time and  
25 make them orally today or submit them in writing.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

16

PM3

Continued, page 16 of 187

1 Thank you for your time this evening. It is my  
2 pleasure to be able to serve each and every one of you to  
3 ensure the safety and security of the maritime community.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Captain Travers.

7 About 72 miles of the Pacific Connector Pipeline  
8 would cross federal lands, including forty miles of BLM  
9 land, 31 miles of Forest Service land and less than a mile  
10 of Reclamation land. At this point I would like to  
11 introduce Miriam Liberatore, who will represent the BLM and  
12 the Forest Service. And she will explain the actions of  
13 those agencies with regard to the project.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. LIBERATORE: Thank you, Paul.

16 And thank you, all of you, for coming out  
17 tonight. Can you all hear me okay?

18 (No response.)

19 MS. LIBERATORE: Great. It sounds really loud to  
20 me.

21 As Paul said, my name is Miriam Liberatore. I'm  
22 with the Medford District BLM. And I'm BLM's project  
23 manager for the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

24 He has already introduced the rest of our team,  
25 but there is one more team member I'd like to introduce to

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

17

1 you. And that's Mark Mackowitz, who is with BLM's National  
2 Project Management Team and our National Transmission  
3 Support Team. And he's in the audience here.

4 Thank you, Mark.

5 I wanted to talk about BLM and Forest Service's  
6 role in the project, and what it is and what it isn't. Our  
7 role is where the pipeline -- it extends to where the  
8 pipeline would cross federal lands. And by federal lands I  
9 mean BLM, Forest Service, and Reclamation administered  
10 lands.

11 Most of the project on federal lands is on BLM,  
12 about 40 miles -- about 30 of it on Forest Service and less  
13 than a mile across the facilities that Reclamation manages.  
14 So our role as BLM -- as the lead agency -- for BLM we're  
15 the lead cooperating agency because of our connection with  
16 the right-of-way grant application.

17 In order to cross federal lands -- and this is  
18 true for anybody, whether you're putting in a driveway to  
19 your home or a pipeline across federal lands -- you have to  
20 apply for a right-of-way grant. And BLM is the agency with  
21 the authority to issue or deny a right-of-way grant.

22 We get that from the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.  
23 And we seek concurrence from our other federal agencies,  
24 from Forest Service and from Reclamation. But the permit --  
25 the right-of-way grant would come from BLM.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

18

PM3

Continued, page 18 of 187

1           What we don't have involvement in is LNG plant.  
2   We have no connection there and we have no involvement in  
3   what happens on private lands, obviously.

4           So there are two decisions that BLM and Forest  
5   Service would need to make for this project. And one of  
6   them has to do with the right-of-way grant. The other one  
7   has to do with our land management plans. I'll talk about  
8   each of those, and then I'll -- and then we'll -- that's  
9   all.

10          So the right-of-way grant, we have received an  
11   application for that. And we have not made a decision yet.  
12   I already explained what that entails but -- or why we need  
13   it. But we won't make our decision on that until the final  
14   EIS has been published and we have all the conditions met  
15   that we need to make our decision.

16          And as far as the land management plan goes, both  
17   agencies have current land management plans, BLM and Forest  
18   Service. And the project as proposed in the Draft EIS would  
19   not conform to them. So in order for us to be able to  
20   consider a right-of-way grant, BLM, we need the project to  
21   conform both to our management plans and to the Forest  
22   Service.

23          Both agencies have policies that allow us to  
24   amend those plans. And so we have proposed a series of  
25   amendments that would allow the project to conform. And

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

19

PM3

Continued, page 19 of 187

1 then we would be able to consider a right-of-way grant.

2           There are 20 amendments proposed. Four of them  
3 are on BLM; 15 for the Forest Service; and one joint  
4 amendment that we would both incorporate.

5           Those amendments have to do with survey and  
6 management guidelines; with habitat protection for the  
7 northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet. They have to  
8 do with other environmental aspects of the project like  
9 riparian areas and soil conditions and visual quality  
10 objectives.

11           And then there's also one that would allow us to  
12 -- the BLM and the Forest Service -- to convert some of our  
13 matrix lands -- which is the allocation where our timber  
14 base lies and most of our other uses lie -- and to convert  
15 that into late successional reserves. And that would be to  
16 mitigate impacts to the late successional reserves that  
17 would be crossed by the pipeline.

18           We welcome all of your comments on the proposals  
19 for the right-of-way and the land plan amendments. We do  
20 not have our own process for them; we are a cooperating  
21 agency. And so our comments will come to us through the  
22 FERC comment process.

23           So all of your comments tonight, if they are  
24 directed to BLM and Forest Service, will go into the record  
25 and we'll respond to them. And then if you have written

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

20

PM3

Continued, page 20 of 187

1 comments, please use FERC's process and their docket number.  
2 And we will respond to those comments as well.  
3 I wanted to mention, too, for the land plan  
4 amendments, that those would affect four districts for the  
5 BLM and three forests for the Forest Service. Those are the  
6 Coos Bay District, the Roseburg District, Medford District,  
7 and the Klamath Falls Resource Area of the Lakeview  
8 District. And then on the Forest Service that would be the  
9 Umpqua National Forest, the Rogue River National Forest, and  
10 the Winema.  
11 So that's all I have for you. Thank you so much  
12 for coming and for giving us your feedback on this project.  
13 And we look forward to hearing from you.  
14 (Applause.)  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Miriam.  
16 Again, people in the aisles, please come forward  
17 to the first row. There's some seats here, some seats here.  
18 We need to get people out of the aisles. So if you'll come  
19 down here we have some seats for you.  
20 If people see seats in the middle of the rows,  
21 please move in so that people can fill them in. Appreciate  
22 that.  
23 Also, if you want to speak tonight and you have  
24 not signed our speakers list, please go into the back, find  
25 John Scott and my Tetra Tech team and sign up to speak.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

21

PM3

Continued, page 21 of 187

1 Okay? We want to give everyone the opportunity to speak who  
2 wants to. But you're only going to get called up if you're  
3 on the speakers list. So this is your last opportunity to  
4 sign up.

5 We are at the beginning of a 90-day period for  
6 taking comments on the DEIS. Comments can be filed with the  
7 Commission up until February 13th, 2015. The FERC keeps a  
8 consolidated record for all of these proceedings. So please  
9 do not send your comments to the BLM or the Forest Service  
10 or the Coast Guard. Send them directly to the FERC and  
11 we'll -- and we and the cooperating agencies will answer  
12 them.

13 Also, do not send me personal e-mails; only  
14 comments placed into the FERC public record on eLibrary will  
15 be considered by the Commission staff.

16 I understand there are some organizations out  
17 there that are providing the public with incorrect  
18 information and telling you to send me e-mails. All right?  
19 That is a deception to keep you from commenting.

20 In order to comment you must place your comments  
21 on the public record. In a couple of minutes I'll explain  
22 exactly how to do that. Don't send me an e-mail.

23 As explained in our Notice of Availability issued  
24 on November 7th, 2014, there are several ways to provide  
25 FERC with your comments on the DEIS.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

22

PM3

Continued, page 22 of 187

1 First, you can use the eComment feature on the  
2 FERC webpage, which is [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov).  
3 Second, you can use the eFiling feature on the  
4 FERC webpage.  
5 Third, you can write a letter to the Secretary of  
6 the Commission at 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C.  
7 20426. Remember to always mark your comments with the  
8 docket numbers, CP13-483-000 for Jordan Cove and  
9 CP13-492-000 for Pacific Connector.  
10 Lastly, you can give oral comments tonight at  
11 these meetings.  
12 All comments received, whether written or oral,  
13 will be given equal weight by the FERC staff and will be  
14 considered in our final EIS. It does not matter if your  
15 comments were submitted on the first day after the DEIS was  
16 issued on November 7th, or received on the last day of the  
17 comment period, February 13th, 2015.  
18 While the purpose of tonight's meeting is to take  
19 verbal comments on the DEIS, given the limited time each  
20 presenter will have in this forum, I urge you to send more  
21 detailed comments to the FERC either electronically or in  
22 writing. The more specific your comments, the better we can  
23 address your concerns. Comments such as 'I am against the  
24 project,' or 'I am in favor of the project,' are not  
25 particularly helpful.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

23

PM3

Continued, page 23 of 187

1           This is not an election or a popularity contest.  
2   Instead, try to focus your comments on the environmental  
3   issues raised in the DEIS.

4           After the comment period ends on February 13th,  
5   2015, the FERC staff and our third-party contractor,  
6   together with the federal cooperating agencies, will review  
7   the comments and address them in the FEIS. The FERC will  
8   issue a revised Notice of Schedule in the near future that  
9   will present a new date for the issuance of the FEIS and the  
10   90-day period for other federal authorizations.

11           No decision about approving or not approving this  
12   project has been made at this time. The EIS is not a  
13   decision document. Only after taking into consideration the  
14   findings in the EIS, together with other non-environmental  
15   factors, such as markets, tariffs and rates, would the  
16   Commissioners make their decision about whether or not to  
17   authorize the project.

18           If the Commission decides to authorize the  
19   project in an order, only parties to the proceeding -- known  
20   as intervenors -- may legally question that decision. The  
21   FERC's requirements for filing a motion to intervene can be  
22   found under Title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, Part  
23   385.124.

24           While the period for filing a motion to intervene  
25   has passed, the Commission will consider requests for late



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

24

PM3

Continued, page 24 of 187

1 intervention with good cause -- typically affected  
2 land-owners and those with legitimate environmental concerns  
3 who cannot be represented by another are considered to have  
4 good cause for intervention.

5       However, simply filing a comment will not give  
6 you intervenor status. But you do not need to be an  
7 intervenor to have your environmental comments considered.  
8 An intervenor may seek a rehearing of a Commission order.

9       If the Commission authorizes the project,  
10 construction may not begin until after Jordan Cove and  
11 Pacific Connector obtain all other necessary federal permits  
12 and approvals. At a minimum, this includes:

13       Biological opinions from the Fish & Wildlife  
14 Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service under the  
15 Endangered Species Act;

16       A right-of-way grant for Pacific Connector issued  
17 by the BLM under the Minerals Leasing Act, with concurrence  
18 from the Forest Service and Reclamation;

19       Permits under Section 10 of the Rivers and  
20 Harbors Act, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act issued by  
21 the Corps of Engineers; water quality certification under  
22 Section 401 of the Clean Water Act issued by the Oregon  
23 Department of Environmental Quality;

24       Permits under the Clean Air Act issued by the  
25 Oregon Department of Environmental Quality;

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

25

PM3

Continued, page 25 of 187

1           And a determination by the Oregon Department of  
2   Land Conservation and Development that the project would be  
3   consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

4           In addition, the Energy Facilities Siting Council  
5   of the Oregon Department of Energy must approve the proposed  
6   South Dune Power Plant associated with the Jordan Cove  
7   terminal.

8           Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector must document  
9   that all pre-construction conditions of the FERC's order  
10   have been met before we will allow construction to begin.  
11   Construction activities would be monitored by FERC and by  
12   the federal land-managing agencies.

13           Now is the best part of the meeting, where you,  
14   the public, get to speak. I remind you the purpose of this  
15   meeting is to hear public comments on our DEIS in general.

16           I will not be responding to your comments tonight  
17   unless you ask an administrative question that I know the  
18   answer to. Otherwise I will just be listening. We will  
19   address your comments in the Final Environmental Impact  
20   Statement after we do the appropriate research.

21           So here are some general ground rules for this  
22   meeting.

23           After I call your name, please come up to the  
24   podium. We have microphones on either side. Come up on  
25   either side. Identify yourself and spell your name for the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

26

PM3

Continued, page 26 of 187

1 court reporter. If you represent an organization, state the  
2 name of that organization. If you are a land-owner along  
3 the pipeline and you happen to know your mile post, please  
4 tell us or give us an address or cross street.

5 If you have a written summary of your comments  
6 please give them to my Tetra Tech team at the back of the  
7 room and they'll make certain they get into the public  
8 record.

9 All right. My number one rule. Show respect to  
10 all speakers, whether you agree with them or not. Please,  
11 no cheering or booing. Let's treat each other with respect  
12 tonight.

13 Lastly, because of the large number of speakers  
14 we expect, each individual will be limited to three minutes  
15 so that everyone who wants to speak will have that  
16 opportunity. However, I believe our contract is only until  
17 eleven o'clock pm, and at eleven I will shut the meeting  
18 down.

19 Mr. Busch next to me has a red and a yellow form.  
20 At two and a half minutes you see yellow, and at three you  
21 see red and you'll have to stop and let the next speaker  
22 have their opportunity.

23 I will call up two to four names at a time so  
24 that you can line up at the microphones, just to move things  
25 along.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

27

PM3

Continued, page 27 of 187

1           We'll now take speakers in the order that they  
2   appeared on the speakers list. I want to ask your  
3   forgiveness in advance if I mis-read or mispronounce your  
4   name. Please correct me when you get to the microphone so  
5   the court reporter can get it right.  
6           The first speaker is Mark Sheldon. After Mark we  
7   have Melody Sheldon and then Curt Clay, and then Bill  
8   Bradbury.  
9           MR. SHELDON: My name is Mark Sheldon, M-a-r-k  
10   S-h-e-l-d-o-n. I live at 95204 Stock Slough Lane, Coos Bay.  
11           I'm an affected land-owner and I'm here to  
12   address the Draft EIS opinion that the alternate Blue Ridge  
13   route between milepost 11-1R and milepost 21.8 would have  
14   more environmental impact than the proposed route, and to  
15   address the proposed Blue Ridge alignment relative to the  
16   northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet home range and  
17   habitat.  
18           The Blue Ridge Alignment, which was developed by  
19   Williams Pacific Connector in late 2013 is not the only  
20   alignment that is constructible on Blue Ridge. There are  
21   multiple ways to avoid the northern spotted owl and marbled  
22   murrelet range and habitat.  
23           The problem here is that Williams Corporation has  
24   never favored any route between milepost 11.1R and milepost  
25   21.8 other than the proposed route. Pacific Connector has

PM3-1

Comment noted.

PM3-1

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

28

1 resisted Blue Ridge for years and they have stated on  
2 multiple occasions that the suggested routes on Blue Ridge  
3 were all unconstructible.

4 Only when FERC in late 2013 compelled Williams to  
5 find and propose a Blue Ridge route did Williams propose a  
6 Blue Ridge route and confirm that it was constructible.  
7 Neither Williams or FERC have adequately analyzed the many  
8 alignment possibilities which exist in the large area we  
9 call Blue Ridge.

10 Please, FERC, compel Williams Pacific Connector  
11 to stop trying to push their way through the rural  
12 residential neighborhoods of Stock Slough, Catching Slough,  
13 Old Wagon Road, South Seminer Road, Boone Creek and others.  
14 I, and many of the affected land owners and home owners, are  
15 fighting this injustice and this great mistake.

16 As for Williams Pacific Connector, they will not  
17 ever favor Blue Ridge. They know that it's faster and  
18 easier and cheaper to push their way through small private  
19 home and land-owners than to deal with the federal oversight  
20 on Blue Ridge. But if this permit is for public convenience  
21 and necessity, then let's put it on public land.

22 Compel Williams to find an alignment over Blue  
23 Ridge that satisfies the northern spotted owl and marbled  
24 murrelet concerns, and which now and always will be a far  
25 less environmental impact than the proposed route between

PM3-1  
Conf'd

PM3-2

PM3-3

## PM3

## Continued, page 28 of 187

PM3-2

While there are no doubt a great number of possible options for connecting any two points, NEPA does not require every possible alternative be considered.

PM3-3

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

29

1 milepost 11R and 21.8.  
2 Thank you.  
3 (Applause.)  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
5 Next is Melody Sheldon.  
6 MS. SHELDON: M-e-l-o-d-y S-h-e-l-d-o-n. I  
7 reside at 95204 Stock Slough.  
8 In your comparison of the Blue Ridge route versus  
9 the proposed route in your Environmental Impact Statement  
10 you noted the names of individuals on Daniels Creek area  
11 that do not have the pipeline going through their property.  
12 These individuals own property a long ways from the Blue  
13 Ridge route. Yet FERC cites their concerns as one of the  
14 reasons that it favors the proposed route versus the Blue  
15 Ridge route.  
16 The Draft EIS's use of these unaffected  
17 individuals' concerns as opposed to the written and  
18 submitted concerns of many along the proposed route  
19 represent a real problem with the Draft EIS. The problem  
20 being that the Draft EIS does not comply with the  
21 requirements set forth by the National Environmental Policy  
22 Act.  
23 The Draft EIS lacks any real analysis of the  
24 pipeline effect on human habitat and habitation on the  
25 proposed route versus the Blue Ridge route. This EIS is

PM3-4

PM3-5

**PM3**

**Continued, page 29 of 187**

PM3-4

The Blue Ridge alternative was proposed by a group of landowners. Their concerns are discussed because they proposed the Blue Ridge Alternative. We do not agree that the DEIS does not comply with NEPA.

PM3-5

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

30

PM3

Continued, page 30 of 187

1 incomplete. And the required analysis of the pipeline's  
2 effect on human habitation and property values is lacking  
3 and is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.  
4       There is no question that the pipeline will  
5 negatively impact property values. The only question is how  
6 much.  
7       In my case the pipeline would cross my property  
8 and be located 200 feet from my house. If you are concerned  
9 about the pipeline on property values, look at the proposed  
10 route and compare it to the Blue Ridge route.  
11       On the proposed route between Coos River and  
12 Fairview, you will find over 20 individual land- and  
13 home-owners who are directly affected and who will fight the  
14 proposed route between Coos River and Fairview. If you are  
15 concerned about environmental impact, put the pipeline on  
16 Blue Ridge. It's the best route and it has the least  
17 environmental impact.  
18       Thank you.  
19       (Applause.)  
20       MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
21       Next is Curt Clay.  
22       After Curt Clay is Bill Bradbury. After Bill  
23 Bradbury would be Kathleen Elman, Paulette Landers, Gary  
24 Landers, and Sylvia Yamada.  
25       MR. CLAY: Okay. It's Clay, C-l-a-y.

PM3-5  
Cont'd

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

31

PM3

Continued, page 31 of 187

1 I live here. I'm a citizen.

2 And thank you for your comments there, Paul, on  
3 the abbreviations in that EIS. It's almost impossible for  
4 the average individual to read that. I'd like to request  
5 that somehow that could be cleared up. I don't know how  
6 you're going to do it.

7 And thank you for making clear that the decision  
8 has not been made to authorize this project yet, although  
9 most of us don't believe that.

10 Okay. I came to share a couple of things that  
11 are just in the news this morning. And so I thought maybe  
12 you hadn't heard it.

13 There's a new study out from the University of  
14 Missouri, Center for Environmental Health and the Institute  
15 for Health and Environment that documents problems with  
16 infertility, pre-term birth, failure to thrive, respiratory  
17 problems and more associated with fracking and its resultant  
18 pollution. They are calling for an end to fracking.

19 Now we're up here -- Does that -- It's all over  
20 the country people are fighting this. Okay. I'll just make  
21 that point.

22 Also in today's news, the former Secretary of  
23 Energy is speaking from Colorado, says, 'We need to stop  
24 fracking and our dependence on fossil fuels.'

25 So all across the country, as I said, people are

PM3-6

PM3-6

Comment noted.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

32

PM3

Continued, page 32 of 187

1 mobilizing against this destructive activity.  
2 Now I don't think they've read your EIS.  
3 I'd like to -- I'm just going to make a couple of  
4 points here.  
5 For one thing, these negative impacts from the  
6 increased hydraulic fracking necessary for Jordan Cove to  
7 proceed was not covered in this Draft EIS. I'd like to see  
8 that covered.  
9 Exporting natural gas would increase the  
10 environmentally destructive practice of hydraulic fracking  
11 because without fracking there would be no excess gas to  
12 export from Coos Bay. And that's why I'm wearing this silly  
13 vest. We don't want to pass gas through Coos Bay.  
14 And, by the way, this vest was put together by a  
15 local couple that retired that lives out on Haynes Inlet.  
16 You probably never heard of it. But it's a salmon rookery.  
17 It's full of oysters. And that's what you're going to dig  
18 up -- not you, but that's what the proposal is: To dig that  
19 up to lay a pipe across there to get to that sand spit out  
20 there that's in the middle of a red tsunami zone. It  
21 shouldn't be built on. I don't know why we're still arguing  
22 about this.  
23 Okay. So that's why most of the citizenry here  
24 in Coos County are opposed to this.  
25 Now we've got folks here from other places that

PM3-7

PM3-7

See the response to IND1-3.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

33

PM3

Continued, page 33 of 187

1 think it might be a good idea. But we're looking at the  
2 largest estuary in Oregon. And, you know, so you say, 'So  
3 what? Can't we sail ships up there?'

4 In this case, 'Sorry.' You know, they're digging  
5 a -- they dig a turn-around for these tankers right where  
6 the salt water mixes with the fresh.

7 Okay. I'm done.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.

9 Curt, if you have written -- if you have some  
10 written things, you might want to give that to John Scott so  
11 that all of your thoughts get into the record.

12 All right. Next is Bill Bradbury.

13 MR. BRADBURY: Thank you very much. My name is  
14 Bill Bradbury. I'm the former Oregon Secretary of State,  
15 and I'm the former State Senator for this area.

16 And I've given over 400 presentations in Oregon  
17 about the impacts of climate change on life as we know it.  
18 And I got to tell you, it's not a pretty picture, with  
19 droughts, floods, and sea level rise.

20 I'm here to oppose the proposed export of  
21 liquefied natural gas. As we all know, LNG is a fossil  
22 fuel. Burning it releases carbon dioxide and other gases  
23 into the atmosphere. For the first time in roughly 500  
24 million years, the amount of carbon dioxide in the earth's  
25 atmosphere has topped 400 parts per million.

PM3-8

PM3-8

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

34

PM3

Continued, page 34 of 187

1           This latest report comes from the Scripps  
2   Institution of Oceanography, who are the keepers of the  
3   famed Keeling curve, which is the longest continuous record  
4   of carbon dioxide measurements on the planet.

5           When Keeling first began his measurements in 1958  
6   the amount of carbon dioxide -- also known as CO2 -- was 316  
7   parts per million. Earlier this year the reading was over  
8   400 parts per million as measured at Mona Loa in Hawaii.

9           Increasing amounts of carbon dioxide and other  
10   gases caused by the burning of oil, gas and coal are  
11   enhancing the greenhouse effect, causing the planet to warm  
12   to levels that climate scientists say can't be linked just  
13   to natural forces.

14          So for the past 800,000 years CO2 levels never  
15   exceeded -- never exceeded -- 300 parts per million. The  
16   400 parts per million threshold is a really sobering  
17   milestone and should serve as a wake-up call for all of us  
18   to support clean energy technology and reduce emissions of  
19   greenhouses gases before it's too late for our children and  
20   grandchildren.

21          I have two daughters and two grandchildren. For  
22   all of them, please don't add more CO2 to the atmosphere.  
23   Please oppose the export of liquefied natural gas.

24          Thank you.

25          (Applause.)

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

35

PM3

Continued, page 35 of 187

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
2 Next speaker is Kathleen Elman. And if I  
3 mispronounce your name, please correct me.  
4 MS. EYMANN: My name is Kathleen Eymann. And  
5 that's spelled K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n E-y-m-a-n-n.  
6 Do you want us to spell our names for the record?  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, I do.  
8 MS. EYMANN: Okay. So I hope I wasn't too fast.  
9 Okay. So I'm an attorney. And I wanted you to  
10 know that the law states that an environmental impact  
11 statement -- quote --  
12 "...must be objectively prepared and not slanted  
13 to support the choice of the agency's preferred alternative  
14 over the other reasonable and feasible alternatives."  
15 Unquote.  
16 The Council on Environmental Quality in the White  
17 House states that -- quote:  
18 "An agency that prepares an EIS so that it can  
19 inform the decisionmaking process in a timely manner and  
20 will not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already  
21 made."  
22 Unquote.  
23 And they go on to warn that:  
24 "Misuse of the National Environmental Protection  
25 Act process to justify decisions already made is

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

36

1 counterproductive and can result in litigation that could  
2 delay and ultimately prevent a proposed action from  
3 proceeding."

4 Unquote.

5       So I want to let you know that this DEIS, which I  
6 will let you know more fully in my written comments but I'll  
7 briefly go over today, is so inadequate that as soon as I am  
8 able, which is when you issue a record of decision, I will  
9 file a legal challenge on behalf of citizens who want a  
10 legally valid process. And that lawsuit will be successful  
11 unless you withdraw this draft Environmental Statement and  
12 re-issue in compliance with the law.

13       First, the heart of an environmental impact  
14 statement is you must be examining alternatives. The  
15 Executive Summary of this draft states this and it promises  
16 -- quote:

17       "The purpose of this document is to inform the  
18 Commission and the public about the potential adverse an  
19 beneficial environmental impacts of the project and its  
20 alternatives."

21 Unquote.

22       That statement in your Executive Summary is  
23 completely misleading as it relates to this project. No  
24 alternative is ever analyzed. Not even a 'no action'  
25 alternative.

PM3-9

---

**PM3**

**Continued, page 36 of 187**

---

PM3-9

Chapter 3 of the DEIS compares numerous alternatives, including No Action, considered to the proposed action.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

37

PM3

Continued, page 37 of 187

PM3-10

Comment noted. See the response to the previous comment.

1 The document says there are no reasonable and  
2 feasible alternatives. Well, what about not doing anything?  
3 That's a reasonable and feasible alternative.

4 The failure to analyze alternatives violate the  
5 intent and letter of the NEPA law. And every court will  
6 agree with me that this EIS must present reasonable and  
7 feasible alternatives and they must be discussed and  
8 analyzed. This draft fails to do so.

9 I, finally, want to let you know that unless you  
10 withdraw this EIS and provide the public with what you  
11 promised -- which is an analysis of all the alternatives --  
12 that it will be overturned. So I request that you withdraw  
13 this, take it back, and give us alternatives to evaluate as  
14 you promised in your Executive Summary.

PM3-10

15 Thank you so much.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

18 The next speaker is Paulette Landers.

19 MS. LANDERS: My name is Paulette Landers,  
20 P-a-u-l-e-t-t-e L-a-n-d-e-r-s.

21 Public interest. Indeed, we have been told that  
22 the proposed Jordan Cove project is in the best public  
23 interest. We have heard that everyone will benefit from  
24 this wondrous project. It will bring jobs, financial  
25 benefit, and growth to our area.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

38

1 Coos County has a high rate of unemployment. You  
2 only need to go to the intersection of Newmark Avenue and  
3 WalMart to see the constant stream of people begging for  
4 their daily meal. Yet Jordan Cove is bringing 2100 workers  
5 imported from elsewhere to fill its work force.

6 If this proposed project is to be here, then the  
7 work force must also be from here.

8 How is public interest served when landowners  
9 have their property confiscated under Eminent Domain and  
10 given 25 percent, or so generously up to 50 percent of  
11 market value for their property, or lose it entirely.

12 What if I propose to buy one of the owners of  
13 Jordan Cove's home for 50 percent of market value because I  
14 would like to build my private airport where he lives? You  
15 bet he would feel a wee bit outraged.

16 As far as I can see, there is little in the  
17 proposed Jordan Cove project that is in the best public  
18 interest. This proposed project will only benefit the  
19 foreign corporation, Jordan Cove, which is simply using our  
20 land to pass its gas in order to export it to Asia.

PM3-11

21 We, on the other hand, will continue to have high  
22 unemployment and a mega-bomb sitting on the Cascadia fault  
23 line. Kaboom.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

---

**PM3**

**Continued, page 38 of 187**

---

PM3-11

Comment noted. The DEIS does not say that the Project is in the public interest.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

39

PM3

Continued, page 39 of 187

1 The next speaker is Gary Landers.

2 MR. LANDERS: Yes. Gary Landers, G-a-r-y

3 L-a-n-d-e-r-s. We live near milepost one on North Bay Road.

4 My wife and I live on the shores of Haynes Inlet,

5 the location of the final miles of the proposed Pacific

6 Connector pipeline. Even though it may pass about 200 feet

7 from our home, we still won't have natural gas. This is not

8 a public utility.

9 I realize a breach of the pipeline is unlikely

10 until it ages or until a catastrophic Cascadia mega-quake

11 and tsunami occur. But by most estimates, they are already

12 overdue.

13 The U.S. Geological Survey estimates an average

14 interval of 150 years for local 8.3 magnitude quakes, and

15 500 years for the M-9 quakes. Jordan Cove's paid

16 consultants differ, estimating an M-8.3 within 1500 years and

17 500 years for an M-9.

18 The Jordan Cove resource report says not to

19 worry. They emphasize, 'There is no historical record of

20 earthquakes magnitude greater than 3.0 within 50 kilometer

21 radius of this site in the database.'

22 But there are no ground motion recording stations

23 within 50 kilometers. And records don't go back very far.

24 And the lack of quakes actually probably only means that

25 Cascadia is accumulating energy for the big one.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

40

1 Oregon Emergency Management in their survival  
2 booklet, Living on Shaky Ground, says the mega-quakes --  
3 quote -- "occur on average about once every 250 years." And  
4 the last was documented on June 26, 1700. The quake is  
5 overdue.

6 Besides shaking things to pieces and causing  
7 tsunamis, great earthquakes cause land to rise and fall and  
8 flip sideways. Jordan Cove papers say vertical displacement  
9 of land in our area during quakes has typically been zero to  
10 1.5 meters.

11 However, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral  
12 Industries experts know past vertical displacement of 1.2 to  
13 three meters in the nearby Coquille Estuary. Can this  
14 pipeline withstand ten feet of sudden earth movement?

15 My wife and I have go-bags filled with emergency  
16 food and clothing and shelter. If we survive the quake we  
17 may be able to grab the bags and hike uphill to avoid to  
18 tsunami. That is, if we are not smothered or incinerated by  
19 leaking gas.

20 Of course, Jordan Cove promises that won't  
21 happen.

22 Now you may have noticed discrepancies between  
23 the claims of Jordan Cove and the findings of state and  
24 federal scientists. In considering who is most accurate,  
25 consider a quote from the famous philosophers Simon and

PM3-12

**PM3**

**Continued, page 40 of 187**

PM3-12

Seismic effects are discussed in section 4.2.2.2 of the EIS. As stated in that section, welded steel pipes have fared well in earthquakes in California. The subsidence is not predicted to be an abrupt change and it is anticipated that the pipeline can span that movement over distance. Also as stated in the FEIS, additional geotechnical studies would be undertaken prior to construction. See also response to IND1-4.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

41

PM3

Continued, page 41 of 187

1 Garfunkel:

2 "Such are promises, all lies and jest. Still, a  
3 man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest."

4 Sadly, I have found this to be true. In the case  
5 of Jordan Cove the men tell you what they want you to hear  
6 and disregard the rest.

7 I urge you to seek out the whole truth, not just  
8 Jordan Cove's self-serving version.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

12 The next several speakers are Sylvia Yamada, Gary  
13 Athens, Dee Willis, and Joseph Morgan.

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is Sylvia here?

16 MS. YAMADA: Yes, I'm here.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: You may speak, Sylvia.

18 MS. YAMADA: My name is Sylvia Yamada,  
19 S-y-l-v-i-a Y-a-m-a-d-a.

20 The Dungeness crab supports an important  
21 commercial and sports fishery from Alaska to California. In  
22 Oregon, the 2014 fishing season yielded 14 million pounds,  
23 \$50 million to crabbers, and an estimated \$100 million to  
24 the Oregon economy. This makes the Dungeness crab fishery  
25 the most valuable commercial fishery in Oregon.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

42

PM3

Continued, page 42 of 187

1           The life cycle of the Dungeness crab is complex  
2   and depends on both the estuarine and near shore habitats.  
3   Mating occurs in shallow water and females migrate offshore  
4   to brood and hatch their eggs.  
5           The early larval stages feed and rear in the near  
6   shore water column, after which the final larval stages ride  
7   tidal currents back to shore, settle out in shallow  
8   estuarine habitats and metamorphose into juvenile crabs.  
9           The highest density of juvenile Dungeness crabs  
10   are found in estuaries, which provide warm water, high  
11   biological productivity, and protection from predation.  
12           Sand substrate and eel grass beds are preferred  
13   habitats for these young crabs, which bury into the sand and  
14   hide in the eel grass to escape predators. Size  
15   measurements of crabs trapped at Russell Point below the  
16   McCullough bridge show that Dungeness crabs in their first  
17   two years of life are extremely abundant in the mid- and low  
18   inter-tidal areas such as pools and eel grass beds  
19           In my research documenting the status of the  
20   non-native European green crab, I encountered young  
21   Dungeness crabs in all my study sites. I selected a subset  
22   of sites -- the north and south side of TransPacific Lane  
23   and the beach adjacent to the Roseburg Forest Product  
24   Watchmans Group.  
25           The results from over 600 trap days show that

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 43

1 young Dungeness crabs are consistently abundant from 2002 to  
2 2014 at all the sites, with an average catch rate of 15 per  
3 trap.

4 These results confirm the findings by Emmett and  
5 Dirkin that estuaries are important nursery habitats for  
6 Dungeness crabs.

7 This point needs to be kept in mind when the  
8 TransPacific Parkway is to be expanded and a berth is to be  
9 cut for ocean-going vessels. Not only will the turbidity  
10 during the construction phase be of concern to the  
11 ecological community, the ongoing dredging to maintain the  
12 berth and shipping channels will continue to be a  
13 disturbance.

14 It will result in habitat loss for native  
15 species, including the valuable Dungeness crab. In one  
16 study between 45 and 85 percent of Dungeness crabs died  
17 during the simulated dredging operation.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you please wrap it up?

19 MS. YAMADA: Yes.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your time is over.

21 MS. YAMADA: Marine habitats modification by  
22 construction of the Jordan Cove Energy Project could impact  
23 the important Oregon Dungeness crab fishery.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

PM3-13

## PM3

## Continued, page 43 of 187

### PM3-13

Effects on aquatic resources from pipeline construction are addressed in section 4.6.2.3. The channel has been dredged for decades. The effects from dredging for this project are addressed in section 4.4.2.1.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

44

PM3

Continued, page 44 of 187

1 I know you've already put one letter into the  
2 record. If you want to put those written records, you can  
3 find John Scott at the top.

4 Next is Gary Athens.

5 MR. THIES: My name is Gary Allen Thiess, Jr.  
6 G-a-r-y T-h-i-e-s. I live at 1840 Johnson Street. That is  
7 in the Airport Heights area of North Bend.

8 I am a journeyman Oregon inside wireman. And I  
9 understand codes and compliances. And I understand that you  
10 have all been placed in the positions that you have in order  
11 to make objective decisions based upon the facts and based  
12 upon your training.

13 I'm trained in the national electrical code,  
14 NFPA-70 and NFPA-72, which is the national fire protection  
15 and signaling code. I am a NICET Level 3 fire alarm  
16 electronic designer. And I do work with hazardous gases and  
17 their transmissions, and detections thereof.

18 I will not take the time to try to tell you what  
19 your job is and what you're supposed to look at when you're  
20 evaluating the environmental impacts of what this project  
21 could bring into our communities. And I know that if you do  
22 approve it and your environmental impact statements are  
23 addressed by other agencies that they're going to rely upon  
24 your professional training and your desire to do your job  
25 well.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

45

PM3

Continued, page 45 of 187

PM3-14

Comment noted.

1 And I want to say of the people that will be  
2 working on this project, many of them will be local  
3 tradesmen who are trained in what they do. And I want you  
4 to know that we appreciate what you're doing, and we want  
5 you to make a concerted effort to make the best choice for  
6 our communities in where this pipeline will travel and what  
7 communities and what people's property will be affected.

8 I want you to examine the facts to the best of  
9 your ability. And I'm just here to say that I support what  
10 you're doing. And I'm also in favor of bringing a project  
11 like this into our community, to developing one of the  
12 largest deep water ports in the United States close to the  
13 Pacific Rim and to use it to its capacity and its ability.

14 Thank you for your time.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dee Willis.

19 MR. WILLIS: My name is Dee Willis, D-e-e-  
20 W-i-l-l-i-s. I live at 60669 South Sumner Road in Coos Bay.

21 The LNG proposed route in the draft EIS goes  
22 directly through my property and crosses two fish-bearing  
23 streams as it does. This is part of the 65 water bodies  
24 that the draft EIS proposed route crosses, versus the eight  
25 water bodies that the proposed Blue Ridge route crosses. I

PM3-14

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

46

1 feel very strongly that the FERC Draft EIS is wrong and the  
2 Blue Ridge route is the better choice.

3 In the Draft EIS there are several references to  
4 the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet habitat  
5 impacts on the proposed Blue Ridge route. But there are  
6 virtually no references to the habitat impacts on the  
7 residents and/or land owners that are affected by the Draft  
8 EIS proposed route.

9 Construction through yards, income-producing  
10 pasture lands, income-producing timber lands, residential  
11 water sources, and just the annoyance of personal property  
12 being used to subsidize a route for a private company.  
13 Again, the Blue Ridge route is the better choice.

14 I am a volunteer fire fighter and EMT with the  
15 fire district that covers most of Stock Slough. Catching  
16 Slough from Stock Slough to Sumner, Old Wagon Road, South  
17 Sumner Road, Boom Creek Road and Coos City Sumner Road from  
18 approximately mile post 1.5 through Sumner towards Fairview.

19 We are a very small department, few volunteers.  
20 And the possible impact on us with the proposed route is  
21 unimaginable. The Blue Ridge route would avoid these  
22 residential areas and is the better choice.

23 Again, I want to say that the FERC Draft EIS  
24 proposed route is wrong and the Blue Ridge route is the  
25 better choice: Less water bodies crossed, less habitat and

PM3-15

**PM3**

**Continued, page 46 of 187**

PM3-15

Effects on landowners affected by the proposed route, as well as on the communities near the route, are discussed in section 4.9.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

47

PM3

Continued, page 47 of 187

1 socioeconomic issues for the residents and/or landowners,  
2 and the safety concerns for all in the proposed route as it  
3 applies to the fire district that I belong to.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

7 After Joseph Morgan, I'd like to call up Charles  
8 Miller, Ron Sadler and Bill McCaffree.

9 DR. MORGAN: My name is Dr. Joseph Morgan,  
10 J-o-s-e-p-h M-o-r-g-a-n. I'm an allergist. And my office  
11 is at 1750 Thompson Road in Coos Bay.

12 I've had a medical practice in Coos Bay for 49  
13 years. And I've seen a lot of changes in the area during  
14 those years, some good and some not so good.

15 We had several large mills when I came here, and  
16 one by one they closed. And there's no argument that this  
17 was bad for the local economy. But at the same time as the  
18 mills closed, I saw improvement in the health of patients  
19 with chronic respiratory disease and other illnesses as our  
20 air quality improved.

21 The DEIS lists a proposed -- or projected  
22 emission of 1177.5 tons per year of air pollutants. And  
23 then the power plant will have additional output. And the  
24 figures I've seen on that have varied, according to sources.  
25 There was an article in the World Newspaper recently



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

48

1 projecting that there would be 2.1 million metric tons of  
2 greenhouse gases produced per year.

3 Now the DEIS also mentioned annual weather cycles  
4 in our area. And it calls our summers dry. However, this  
5 is not strictly the case.

6 It gave no consideration for the amount of fog we  
7 have. And actually our relative humidity is sometimes the  
8 highest in July and August. And fog will tend to trap air  
9 pollutants, hold them closer to the ground. And there's an  
10 increased opportunity for inhalation.

11 Now of this total of over 1100 tons per year, 558  
12 tons will be in the form of gases as oxides of nitrogen and  
13 sulfur, volatile organic chemical compounds, and some will  
14 be carbon monoxide.

15 Almost 372 tons will be in the form of what are  
16 called fine particulates. These are particles that lodge  
17 deep within the lungs and the body has no way to remove  
18 them.

19 The DEIS said there should be no hydrogen sulfide  
20 produced. And I hope this is correct because this is  
21 incredibly toxic. And there is no safe exposure level at  
22 all.

23 Now current medical research has clearly shown  
24 that all of these substances, including the greenhouse  
25 gases, and cause human illness. It is not the situation

PM3-16

PM3-17

## PM3

## Continued, page 48 of 187

PM3-16

The Coos County Weather Service provides the following description: "the coastal zone is characterized by wet winters, relatively dry summers, and mild temperatures throughout the year." Coos Bay has some summer fog but is well north of the fog belt, which extends from extreme southwest Oregon through Monterey County in central. CA.

PM3-17

Comment noted. See the estimates for pollution levels in section 4.12.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

49

1 where there's going to be a body count in weeks or months.  
2 But some cases will have acute symptoms; for others it may  
3 take years or even decades.  
4 But it's simply a fact that some persons are more  
5 susceptible to these conditions than others. And often the  
6 so-called permissible levels of exposure are too high to  
7 protect a given individual.  
8 Now I can safely say from long experience -- and  
9 without exaggerating -- that many here this evening will  
10 eventually see this happen either to themselves or a loved  
11 one --  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dr. Morgan, I'd like to ask you to  
13 wrap it up.  
14 DR. MORGAN: -- over time.  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: And you can put your --  
16 DR. MORGAN: So there needs to be --  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- comments in the record.  
18 DR. MORGAN: There needs to be much more  
19 consideration of health effects of putting this much  
20 pollution into the local air.  
21 Thank you.  
22 (Applause.)  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
24 Next is Charles Miller.  
25 MR. MILLER: I am Charles Miller. C-h-a-r-l-e-s

PM3-17  
Cont'd

PM3-18

## PM3

## Continued, page 49 of 187

PM3-18

As stated in section 4.13, pollution levels would be well below state and national air quality standards (page 4-885).

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

50

1 M-i-l-l-e-r. I am a professor emeritus of oceanography at  
2 Oregon State University.

3 A strong probability has been established by  
4 Oregon State geologist Christopher and colleagues that a  
5 powerful earthquake and tsunami sequence will be generated  
6 by the near to the coast Cascadia subduction zone during the  
7 active life of the JSEP LNG terminal. The impacts added by  
8 the terminal to those of such an earthquake and tsunami are  
9 unacceptable.

10 Geo-engineering consultants evaluated the likely  
11 earthquakes that could impact the project in several Oregon  
12 Department of Geology categories of subduction slip as  
13 appropriate to the plant design. Earthquakes expected from  
14 all the categories have moment magnitudes similar to Richter  
15 scale numbers of 8.9 or 9.0. Such quakes are intensely  
16 violent.

17 Tsunami expert Joseph Zhang produced tsunami  
18 models for JSEP, the results of which are not explicitly  
19 shown in the EIS. The model is as good as could be done.  
20 But it includes only one incoming wave. There is no tsunami  
21 trough behind that.

22 Real initial tsunami arriving inside bays are  
23 followed by tsunami troughs as deep below the original water  
24 surface as the wave was above it.

25 Moreover, many equally large waves and deep

PM3-19

**PM3**

**Continued, page 50 of 187**

PM3-19

See the response to IND1-4 and IND51-5. Also see the analysis in section 4.2.1.3 of the EIS.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

51

PM3

Continued, page 51 of 187

1   troughs can continue for up to ten or 20 hours after the  
2   first in-rush. The sequences are prolonged horrors. The  
3   quake and tsunami into Hoko, Japan in 2011 tortured and  
4   killed the people of cities and coastal valleys for hour  
5   after hour.  
6         The EIS should describe that horror sufficiently.  
7   Here's a preview:  
8         The shaking will move houses and other buildings  
9   off their foundations, generating rubble and trapping many  
10  people. Shaking at accelerations up to 70 percent of  
11  gravity will throw people down, tip shelving onto them,  
12  collapse roofs and walls, open impassible faults in the  
13  streets, drop bridges, break natural gas lines, probably  
14  including the Pacific Connector, start fires, break water  
15  mains serving fire hydrants, and the list goes on.  
16         All first responders and every other capable  
17  person will be fully occupied dealing with the immediate  
18  crisis. And then comes the tsunami.  
19         Anybody who has not departed for high ground --  
20  likely because they now cannot -- can be swept away or  
21  drowned while trapped behind a barrier.  
22         Immediately after a quake the 24/7 emergency  
23  response teams at JSEP will be dealing with a wide array of  
24  impacts once they manage to pick themselves off the floor of  
25  their station. They won't know a tsunami will arrive in

PM3-19  
Conf'd

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

52

PM3

Continued, page 52 of 187

1 about 20 minutes.

2 But before it does, there will be so many things  
3 to deal with under impossible conditions of electric power  
4 outage, darkness, simultaneous rain and wind, injured plant  
5 workers, that they would be lucky to get the LNG transfer  
6 arms detached from a moored LNG carrier.

7 Actually, a tsunami will lift the carrier moored  
8 in the new basin since the buoyancy will either pull out the  
9 boards to which it is attached or it will break the mooring  
10 cables. LNG cables will either be run aground or drift in  
11 the enhanced flow.

12 The notion that tug boats are going to maneuver  
13 themselves in a carrier and the comings and goings of a  
14 tsunami flow are fantasy. In the midst of all this,  
15 something on the ship or the terminal is extremely likely to  
16 break and release LNG --

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dr. Miller --

18 MR. MILLER: -- while the action --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- your time is up.

20 MR. MILLER: -- elevation earthquake engineering  
21 notwithstanding.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: And you can file your comments on  
23 the record.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

53

1 The next speaker is Ron Sadler.

2 MR. SADLER: My name is Ron Sadler, R-o-n

3 S-a-d-l-e-r.

4 Under existing regulations a valid environmental

5 impact statement for the Jordan Cove proposal would consist

6 of four main segments. In the first segment of a viable EIS

7 FERC would specify the underlying purpose and need to which

8 it is responding.

9 In the Jordan Cove Draft EIS, however, FERC tells

10 us that the purpose and need for the proposed project was

11 defined by the Jordan Cove applicant itself.

12 The second part of a valid EIS would list the

13 alternative ways to meet the stated need. Given a narrowly

14 defined statement of need provided by the applicant, FERC

15 conveniently finds in the draft EIS that there simply are no

16 reasonable alternatives to the Jordan Cove proposal.

17 However, in its scoping comments to FERC the

18 Environmental Protection Agency states that the Jordan Cove

19 proposal should be discussed within the context of the 13

20 other proposed LNG export terminals currently before FERC.

21 FERC's response in the draft EIS is that it is

22 FERC's policy to allow market forces to influence where LNG

23 terminals should be situated. Apparently, environmental

24 considerations play no role whatsoever in FERC's process.

25 The third segment of a valid EIS calls for a

PM3-20

PM3-21

PM3-22

## PM3

## Continued, page 53 of 187

PM3-20

Section 1.3 discusses applicant's purpose and need for the project. Section 1.4 discusses the purpose and scope of the EIS for each of the cooperating agencies and for FERC. The Commission will determine the need for the project, not the EIS.

PM3-21

Alternatives are discussed in chapter 3. It is not correct that FERC found there were no reasonable alternatives to the Project. The DEIS states in section 3.2.2.4 that the proposed Oregon LNG Project may be considered a viable alternative to this Project. This project is being analyzed in a separate EIS.

PM3-22

The affected environment is discussed in each section of chapter 4 for the resource discussed in that section. While there is no separate heading titled Affected Environment, much of the more than 1,000 pages in chapter 4 are devoted to describing the affected environment.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

54

1 description of the affected environment within the vicinity  
2 of the proposal. It is meant to form a baseline of existing  
3 environmental conditions so as to be able to make a valid  
4 assessment of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects  
5 of the proposed project.

6 In the draft EIS FERC simply omits this segment  
7 entirely.

8 The final segment of a valid EIS, entitled  
9 Environmental Consequences, is meant to provide the  
10 scientific and analytical basis for the comparison of the  
11 proposed action and all reasonable alternatives.

12 In the draft EIS FERC has already determined that  
13 there are no reasonable alternatives, so this section  
14 becomes a 1000 page justification and rationalization of the  
15 Jordan Cove proposal, which is a direct violation of  
16 existing NEPA regulations.

17 To summarize, the Jordan Cove draft EIS is a 5000  
18 page attempt to evade and circumvent the letter and intent  
19 of the National Environmental Policy Act. I ask that FERC  
20 rescind the current draft EIS and go back to the drawing  
21 board and prepare a new draft EIS that is in full compliance  
22 with existing law and regulations. In other words, do it  
23 right for a change.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

PM3-22  
Cont'd

PM3-23

PM3-24

**PM3**

**Continued, page 54 of 187**

PM3-23

Comment noted. See the above response concerning alternatives.

PM3-24

The current DEIS is in compliance with the applicable laws, including NEPA.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

55

PM3

Continued, page 55 of 187

1           The next speakers are Bill McCaffree, Ron Larue,  
2   John Clarke, and Martha Clemons.

3           MR. MC CAFFREE: Good evening. My name is Bill  
4   McCaffree, B-i-l-l M-c-C-a-f-f-r-e-e. 2650 Cedar Street,  
5   North Bend, Oregon.

6           I am a 40-year plus member of the IDEW, Local 932  
7   in North Bend, Oregon. And I'm also a small business owner.  
8   And I'd like to address some of the socioeconomic impacts to  
9   small businesses.

10          In anticipation of the Jordan Cove project the  
11   unions are ramping up their labor rates right now. Union  
12   electricians would receive at least \$350 a week in addition  
13   to wages just to work on the Jordan Cove Energy Project  
14   instead of local shop jobs.

15          The extra pay for Jordan Cove would drain local  
16   union shops of many people. And the shops would be  
17   disadvantaged due to the pay inequity from Jordan Cove, and  
18   certainly lose employees.

19          When Jordan Cove would end most journeymen would  
20   not have local jobs to come back to because the shop jobs  
21   would have been filled by apprentices or travelers. The  
22   excess of apprentices and journeymen would have to travel  
23   out of the area for work.

24          The high wages would defer local consumers from  
25   hiring union labor and invoke wage cuts like we had back in



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

56

1 the '80s.  
2 The majority of workers for this project would be  
3 outsiders. They would take their wages and leave the area.  
4 I know because I did just that in the early '80s when I  
5 worked on a large industrial project in Washington State.  
6 Recently the union has difficulty in filling  
7 local jobs. For example, the union took my apprentice for a  
8 small hospital job last summer, and leaving my business  
9 disadvantaged.  
10 The answer to our energy needs isn't the finite  
11 gas and oil industry. Fresno, California IBEW Local 100 was  
12 in big trouble five years ago with almost 40 percent of  
13 their members out of work.  
14 In the last three years 50 megawatt and larger  
15 solar projects have virtually provided full employment,  
16 accounting for 80 percent of the work -- and their local.  
17 Kevin Cole, business manager for Local 100, said 'Solar  
18 saved our local.'  
19 With the global drop in oil prices the production  
20 of gas and oil from the oil sands developments in Canada may  
21 just slow down. It has already affected at three three  
22 multi-billion dollar contracts by postponing or canceling  
23 them.  
24 The draft EIS basically ignores many things, like  
25 the transportation to job site impact of workers coming from

PM3-25

**PM3**

**Continued, page 56 of 187**

PM3-25

The comment is not correct. See section 4.9 for a lengthy discussion of these issues.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

57

1 RV parks and local housing. It's incomplete. DES page  
2 4-839.  
3 And the comparison of peak shaving plants to the  
4 Jordan Cove facility and the South Dunes Power Plant, DEIS  
5 page 4-791, mentions eleven LNG facilities but doesn't  
6 elaborate what type of facility they are. And, of course,  
7 there's land theft via eminent domain.  
8 If you support Jordan Cove, you support land  
9 theft, straight out.  
10 Exporting our non-renewable resources helps  
11 foreign businesses and industries and puts the U.S. at a  
12 disadvantage.  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. McCaffree, I'd like you to  
14 wrap it up, please.  
15 MR. MC CAFFREE: I say no to LNG; I say yes to  
16 local manufacturing and exporting local manufactured  
17 products, and yes to renewables and sustainable jobs. No  
18 more boondoggles.  
19 (Applause.)  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
21 Next is Ron Larue -- or Lorell.  
22 MR. LOVELL: My name is Ron Lovell, R-o-n  
23 L-o-v-e-l-l. I'm speaking for my parents, Nolan and Ellen  
24 Lovell, who are affected land-owners of the proposed  
25 pipeline route. They live at 61984 Old Wagon Road in Coos

PM3-25  
Cont'd

PM3-26

**PM3**

**Continued, page 57 of 187**

**PM3-26**

The text discusses a study conducted near a peak shaving plant in Newport and Portland and identifies the two cities. It also discussed a study of 262 facilities, including 11 LNG facilities, and states that these were “across the country.” The study is cited and can be found in the reference section (appendix U) if a reader wishes to see details of the study.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

58

1 Bay and have two affected streams on their property. They  
2 are in support of the Blue Ridge alternative route.  
3 The Environmental Impact Statement draft is  
4 misleading as it portrays the environmental and personal  
5 impact to the total number of home owners by asking only how  
6 many residences are within 50 feet of the construction right  
7 of way, as opposed to comparing the total number of  
8 residences within 50, 100, 200, 300, and 500 feet of the  
9 proposed route versus the Blue Ridge route.  
10 The draft EIS incorrectly portrays the risks to  
11 water supply and risk to shallow wells on the proposed  
12 route. The draft EIS lists only one well that is within 50  
13 feet of the construction right of way. This is misleading  
14 as the effect to those who get their water from year-round  
15 springs and shallow wells will be many times greater than  
16 one well.  
17 The Blue Ridge route, by contrast, will affect no  
18 one's water supply.  
19 FERC's Table 3.4.2.2-1, pages 3-28 in the Draft  
20 Environmental Impact Statement, states that there are 12  
21 streams crossing the proposed route versus nine on the Blue  
22 Ridge alternative. Yet the FERC's Note D on the table notes  
23 41 perennial and 24 intermittent streams on the proposed  
24 route. How many are there?  
25 The table does not give valid comparisons.

PM3-27

PM3-28

PM3-29

**PM3**

**Continued, page 58 of 187**

- PM3-27 There is no grounds or precedent set to assess homes within 100, 200, 300, or 500 feet. The commenter provides no reasoning for these distances.
- PM3-28 Comment noted. Additional information on effects on wells and drinking water sources is in the FEIS.
- PM3-29 The DEIS lists 12 waterbodies crossed for the Proposed Route and 9 for the Modified Blue Ridge Alternative. These numbers are based on hydrography data (see table 3.4.2.2-1). As noted in the footnote of that table, field surveys identified 41 perennial streams and 24 intermittent streams along the Proposed Route. Field surveys have not been completed for Blue Ridge route but they would most likely identify many additional small streams. Because there are no surveys on the Blue Ridge Route, desktop surveys are used for comparison and the survey information was provided for context.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

59

1 For these reasons and others, my parents feel  
2 that the Blue Ridge alternative route is the preferred route  
3 for the pipeline.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: John Clarke.

8 MR. CLARKE: John Clark. J-o-h-n C-l-a-r-k-e.

9 Mile post 60.

10 A short time ago Senator Cruz made a statement to  
11 the Chamber of Commerce. And in it he started that global  
12 warming was a fantasy. And so he offered no documentations  
13 or anything.

14 I want to read you just a little short article.  
15 It's just a little paragraph.

16 Last month was the warmest October globally since  
17 weather records began being kept in the late 1800s. With  
18 greenhouse gas levels climbing to their highest level in  
19 800,000 years, this year also produced the warmest April,  
20 May, June, August, and September.

21 To put two million tons of greenhouse gas into  
22 the atmosphere for strictly generating power to liquefy gas  
23 for convenience in shipping it to some foreign market is not  
24 in the public interest.

25 63 percent of the land crossed by the pipeline is

PM3-30

**PM3**

**Continued, page 59 of 187**

PM3-30

The FERC makes no determination as to whether the project is in the public interest. This will be determined by the Commission.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

60

1 forested land. To take millions of trees out of the  
2 inventory is not in the public interest.  
3 In your -- on your page 1-13 you noted that  
4 Jordan Cove stated that there was a surplus of one billion  
5 cubic feet per day of gas at Malin. That's because of the  
6 Ruby pipeline. They want to take that one billion cubic  
7 feet of gas a day and export it.  
8 Now if you take your surplus away, how do they  
9 have gas for all of these industries that you're going to  
10 create by going to natural gas? It's going to raise the  
11 price of the domestic supply. That's not in the public  
12 interest.  
13 I'll close quickly with the placing of a  
14 hazardous facility in a tsunami inundation zone is not in  
15 the public interest, and especially when it's at the end of  
16 a runway. There's a primary impact area at the end of that  
17 runway. And you're putting in -- or they're proposing to  
18 put in the liquefaction trains.  
19 (Applause.)  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
21 The next speakers on the list are Martha Clemons,  
22 Will Wright, Richard Knablin, Jonathan Hanson, and Jimmy  
23 Haun.  
24 MS. CLEMONS: Martha Clemons.  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Martha?

PM3-31

**PM3**

**Continued, page 60 of 187**

PM3-31

A 2012 study by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) stated: "...U.S. natural gas prices are projected to rise over the long run, even before considering the possibility of additional exports." Another 2012 study by NERA Economic Consultants for DOE found that the nation is "...projected to gain net economic benefits from allowing LNG exports."

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

61

1 MS. CLEMONS: Yes.  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please speak.  
3 MS. CLEMONS: Yes. My name is Martha Clemons,  
4 C-l-e-m-o-n-s.  
5 I feel compelled to speak out tonight that FERC  
6 must reject any and all permits for the proposed Jordan Cove  
7 Energy Project, LNG terminal, and connecting pipelines.  
8 There are many reasons, as you've already heard, why this  
9 project is a bad idea. I'm going to speak about just one,  
10 the greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide, or CO2.  
11 The presence of CO2 in the atmosphere at such  
12 high levels as we have now, 400 parts per million as Mr.  
13 Bradbury pointed out, warms the planet and destabilizes the  
14 climate. The debate is over about that. Research continues  
15 to support that global warming is a direct result of the  
16 buildup of carbon emissions in the atmosphere.  
17 This global warming results in problems, like  
18 severe and dangerous super-storms, melting of the Greenland  
19 ice sheet, release of methane from melting permafrost,  
20 warming oceans, sea level rise, and extinction of species.  
21 Although your DEIS addresses the CO2 emissions  
22 from the generating plant that will power the LNG terminal,  
23 it does not take into account the greenhouse gas impacts  
24 from the additional fracking that will occur or the burning  
25 of the exported U.S. gas in the foreign markets. These

PM3-32

PM3

Continued, page 61 of 187

PM3-32

See the responses to IND1-1 and IND1-3.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

62

1 impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant levels.  
2           The notion that natural gas is a clean  
3 alternative fuel is false. To extract gas by fracking, an  
4 environmentally destructive process in itself, transported  
5 in pressurized pipelines that can leak and start fires, use  
6 tremendous amounts of energy to convert it to LNG and ship  
7 it overseas for burning there is unconscionable.  
8           Ultimately this process will release millions of  
9 tons of new CO2 and will contribute to an unstable and  
10 potentially unlivable climate. And what for? Enormous  
11 profits for a few while the systems that sustain life on  
12 earth as we know it will be irretrievably damaged.  
13           This is not acceptable. I don't know of anyone  
14 who could accept that. It is morally wrong to leave a  
15 ransacked planet for our children and our grandchildren.  
16           The last report from the Inter-Governmental Panel  
17 on Climate Change states that there needs to be a huge shift  
18 away from carbon-intensive energy sources to head off the  
19 worst effects of global warming. We must begin a rapid  
20 transition away from all fossil fuels, including natural  
21 gas, and keep the rest of that resource in reserve for our  
22 future generations.  
23           You, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,  
24 have the obligation to regulate to that end. And you must  
25 start now by denying all permits to build LNG terminals and

PM3-33

---

**PM3           Continued, page 62 of 187**

---

PM3-33           FERC does not regulate either fracking or greenhouse gases.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

63

PM3

Continued, page 63 of 187

1 connecting pipelines.  
2 You could invest -- Oh. And to the corporation,  
3 Jordan Cove or Verison or whatever you're calling  
4 yourselves, if you want to help the community of Coos Bay  
5 you are an energy company --  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's time now to wrap it up.  
7 MS. CLEMONS: And you could invest in helping us  
8 all to convert to renewable energies and we would all thank  
9 you.  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
11 (Applause.)  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next speaker is Will Wright.  
13 MR. WRIGHT: Good evening, gentlemen, ladies and  
14 gentlemen. My name is William Wright. W-i-l-l-i-a-m  
15 Wright, W-r-i-g-h-t. I'm a retired mechanical engineer  
16 professional status.  
17 If the pipeline is to be brought in, I urge you:  
18 put it on the Blue Ridge site for a number of very important  
19 reasons. I believe that the information provided to FERC in  
20 many cases is inadequate, irrelevant, and wrong. That  
21 information does not appear to have been seriously vetted.  
22 The Blue Ridge route has eight water crossings  
23 where the low-level crossings are 30 -- pardon me, 65 -- and  
24 which are in a saline or a brackish environment, which  
25 presents corrosion problems.

PM3-33  
Cont'd



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

64

PM3

Continued, page 64 of 187

1           The 77 acres that my wife and I own are about the  
2 mile post eight or thereabouts, Old Wagon Road and Anchor  
3 Road junction area. This property is -- what? -- 2000  
4 ditch is going to be dug across our property, which is  
5 partially tree farm at this time, but it was bought as rural  
6 residential investment.

7           The county is going to badly need rural  
8 residences for the future as the economy grows. But what  
9 mother is going to want to raise her kids next to a high  
10 pressure gas pipeline.

11           The terrain there is steep, deep, uphill, wet.  
12 It's got a lot of construction problems. And I think the  
13 Blue Ridge route would circumvent all of that.

14           Blue Ridge is nearly free of dwellings. The  
15 lower level pipeline has many dwellings on it.

16           To say that there's only one house within 50 feet  
17 of the pipeline is absurd. What's 50 foot? That's  
18 practically inside your living room. So if you looked at  
19 200, 500 or 1000 feet, that would make some sense. But it  
20 would show how irrelevant some of the information that  
21 Jordan Cove has provided is.

22           Another problem with putting a high pressure  
23 pipeline across many little private properties is that the  
24 individuals you're dealing with are naive, they're innocent,  
25 they're unschooled in the technologies of pipelines and

PM3-34

PM3-34

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 65

1 welding and pipeline fires and all. When things start to go  
2 wrong they are virtually helpless. They have no real  
3 standing to make the mishaps or the surprises that are going  
4 to show up in the program visible.

5 Whereas the Blue Ridge route will have generous  
6 federal inspectors to watch what's going on. And they have  
7 immediate capability to make corrections if necessary.

8 If the pipeline is to be approved I urge you to  
9 put it on Blue Ridge rather than up the river valley.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Richard  
14 Knablin.

15 MR. KNABLIN: Hello. My name is Richard Knablin,  
16 K-n-a-b-l-i-n. I live on Delaware Street in North Bend  
17 right on the edge of the explosive zone.

18 Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I  
19 asked for an extension of comment time as this DEIS is far  
20 too complex to examine in the time allotted. I mean a  
21 thousand pages.

22 This DEIS also appear to be incomplete. There  
23 are so many 'will be dones' and 'should be dones' throughout  
24 that it seems little has been firmly established. The  
25 pipeline route itself is not established. The FAA has not

PM3-35

PM3-36

**PM3**

**Continued, page 65 of 187**

- PM3-35 The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.
- PM3-36 This is a draft EIS, not a final. Additional information will be added in the FEIS. Other requirements are likely to be included in the FERC order, if the project is approved by the Commission.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

66

1 given its approval. The Army Corps of Engineers needs to  
2 weigh in.

3 And there are many state agencies who must be  
4 heard before this report is complete. More reasons to  
5 extend the time limit for public consideration of a truer  
6 look at this project.

7 Apparently the purpose and need for this project  
8 was defined by Jordan Cove and accepted by FERC. That  
9 purpose appears to be corporate profits. As there is no  
10 benefit to anyone else from this project, 30 to 50 permanent  
11 jobs is not enough justification for the enormous negative  
12 impact permanently impressed on southern Oregon.

13 According to Jordan Cove's application, the  
14 project is a market-driven response to the increasing  
15 availability of competitively priced natural gas from  
16 western Canada and Rocky Mountain sources, and robust  
17 international demand for natural gas.

18 Then it goes on to admit there are no firm  
19 buyers, no market as yet for this gas. There was supposed  
20 to be a pipeline precedent agreement executed by October  
21 2014. But I have not seen any of that yet.

22 New reports show that by 2030 Jordan Cove will be  
23 the largest emitter of air pollution in the State of Oregon.  
24 Natural gas is mostly methane, a harmful gas that would be  
25 released inevitably as it moves through the Jordan Cove

PM3

Continued, page 66 of 187

PM3-37

We have sent a data request to the applicant regarding this issue.  
Their response to this request will be incorporated into the FEIS.

PM3-37

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

67

1 pipes and processes. And, of course, the project is upwind  
2 from the largest concentration of human habitation on the  
3 Oregon coast.

4 Sea level rise. On April 2nd, 2014 communication  
5 to FERC relayed that -- quote:

6 Given the uncertainties and predictions of sea  
7 level change along the Oregon coast and negative trends of  
8 these changes along some areas of the coast, namely due to  
9 the tectonic rise, it is recommended not to include sea  
10 level rise factor into the tsunami modeling procedure.

11 This attitude seems to represent the bottom line  
12 for Verison: Dismiss the unknown variables.

13 A reputable EIS requires a baseline study of all  
14 affected lands and waters. Such a study has not been done  
15 on the Coos Bay. But what is known is that pollutants such  
16 as BPAs, tributyltin, PCBs, et cetera, do exist in the Bay  
17 mud. A warning for any dredging that might take place to  
18 widen and deepen the shipping channel.

19 Finally --

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can I ask you to wrap it up now?

21 MR. WRIGHT: I would like to plead with the  
22 agency to not turn Coos County into the latest energy  
23 sacrifice zone for the sake of corporate profits. Just say  
24 no to Jordan Cove.

25 Thank you.

PM3-38

**PM3**

**Continued, page 67 of 187**

PM3-38

Resource Report 2 filed with FERC on February 6, 2013 and available on eLibrary, describes the water quality and dredge material studies in the bay. The appendices to this report present the sampling details and results.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

68

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
2 (Applause.)  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Jonathan  
4 Hanson.  
5 MR. HANSON: Good evening. My name is Jonathan  
6 Hanson. J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n H-a-n-s-o-n. Coos Bay, Oregon.  
7 And I'm really terrified because we are -- and  
8 this country is at war with terror. And looking around this  
9 room this evening at all these faces, I can't understand how  
10 many of these people could possibly be from Coos Bay.  
11 However, it's terrifying because you're really  
12 confusing -- you've been misled and you've been led down the  
13 garden path by really good people, experts at doing this.  
14 So I'm, you know, I don't fault you for being led down this  
15 path. And I understand the economy being what it is and  
16 everything.  
17 But to the Coast Guard, I see nothing in here or  
18 any other one about the fact that we're in a war on terror  
19 and that terrorists are going to be -- and somebody with a  
20 shoulder-fired whatchamacallit could set one of these things  
21 off as it goes by or something. Or attack the tanks or  
22 something.  
23 And so what I'm saying is where's the budget for  
24 Blackwater or whatever company is going to be coming in here  
25 with machine guns on their little boats skipping around in

PM3-39

**PM3**

**Continued, page 68 of 187**

PM3-39

The risk of a terrorist attack is low but possible; however, your concern would apply equally to thousands of other facilities across the county.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

69

PM3

Continued, page 69 of 187

PM3-40

Comment noted.

1 the harbor to keep us bad people at bay. Where's that?  
2 I don't see anything in the Coast Guard that says  
3 anything about security or -- what's they call it? The  
4 Homeland Security. There's no Homeland Security report in  
5 here.  
6 So I'm saying that that's a secret that we're not  
7 being let in on. And I'm saying that that is a condition  
8 that's going to jump up and bite all of us and we're not  
9 going to understand what happened when we don't own this bay  
10 that we live on any more, when it's taken over by foreign  
11 powers. And this is an invasion.  
12 So that's just on that for the Coast Guard.  
13 However, for the rest of it, I agree with what  
14 has been said and by what Ron said, that this is written by  
15 Jordan Cove. It's not written by FERC. You just put your  
16 stamp down here in the corner. This is written by Jordan  
17 Cove. And it says so right in here. And you concede to  
18 that.  
19 So this is not impartial; this is not democratic.  
20 This is baloney, this is malarkey.  
21 This is foreign countries taking over. And I  
22 can't -- and I'm terrified that so many of my neighbors are  
23 so na ve.  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
25 (Applause.)

PM3-40

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

70

PM3

Continued, page 70 of 187

PM3-41

Comment noted.

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Jimmy Haun.  
2 After Jimmy is Linda Sweatt, Clarence Adams, Ron Petock.  
3 MR. HAUN: Thank you.  
4 Good evening. My name is Jimmy Haun, J-i-m-m-y  
5 H-a-u-n. I'm speaking on behalf of the 22,000 members of  
6 the Northwest Carpenters. I support the proposed Jordan  
7 Cove Energy Project.  
8 I want to thank FERC, the DOE, the BLM, the  
9 Forest Service, the Coast Guard, and the various other  
10 federal agencies and entities for their years of tireless  
11 work. Ensuring that our natural resources are protected is  
12 important to all of us.  
13 We should all be thankful to have the opportunity  
14 to exercise our rights to speak about this project.  
15 This beautiful facility on Southern Oregon  
16 Community College Campus was built within the natural  
17 habitat of the Upper Empire Lake. The utmost care was taken  
18 to protect the pristine beauty of the lake and its  
19 surroundings while under construction. We all now get to  
20 use this facility and to enjoy it.  
21 The highly skilled men and women are ready to  
22 spend over ten million hours to build the Jordan Cove Energy  
23 Project with care and respect for the environment. That's  
24 what we do. That's what professionals do.  
25 Many of these construction professionals are here

PM3-41

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

71

1 tonight wearing high vis lime green shirts. Some of these  
2 men and women moved away from here because there were no  
3 construction jobs. Let's bring them home. Let's build this  
4 project together with the respect due to the environment and  
5 let's boost the southern Oregon economy.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: While I appreciate your  
10 enthusiasm, I'd like to caution you that we want to show  
11 everyone respect regardless of their opinion, and therefore  
12 I'd like no more cheering and no booing. Let's just let  
13 people say what they have to say and move on. We have a lot  
14 of people who want to speak tonight.

15 Next is Linda Sweatt.

16 MS. SWEATT: My name is Linda Sweatt. L-i-n-d-a  
17 S-w-e-a-t-t. I am a retired educator who has lived and  
18 worked in Coos County most of my life. I live in the  
19 Simpson Heights neighborhood of North Bend.

20 I request that the Draft EIS be revised to  
21 include alternative sites for the work force housing as per  
22 NEPA Regulation 40 CFR 1502.5. And that the DEIS  
23 recommended transportation impact analysis be completed by  
24 state and local agencies.

25 I was not notified when my city planning

PM3-42

**PM3**

**Continued, page 71 of 187**

PM3-42

Comment noted. See the requirement for the applicant to ODOT and the counties crossed and revise their transportation plan accordingly.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

72

1 Commission was considering work force housing zoning  
2 approval. But from the north side of my house I will be  
3 able to see and hear much of the road where construction  
4 equipment, cars, trucks and buses of all 2100 workers will  
5 be funneled to and from the housing area.  
6 This huge influx of population and traffic does  
7 not appear to be considered in the DEIS and no alternative  
8 sites suggested, a direct violation of the NEPA regulation I  
9 mentioned earlier. How will the companies involved deal  
10 with the noise, visual pollution, and safety issues  
11 connected to placing the work force housing and a population  
12 more than seven times of our small neighborhood in adjoining  
13 areas? No alternatives or mitigation solutions have been  
14 proposed.  
15 On pages 4-839 and 4-840, the DEIS recommends  
16 that Jordan Cove file a revised transportation impact  
17 analysis that addresses the use of offsite parking lots and  
18 transportation of workers to the terminal by bus or rail,  
19 and that they document that they provided copies and  
20 comments to local governmental agencies.  
21 This should have been done already.  
22 I strongly urge that the Draft EIS be revised to  
23 include clear and precise language and that the huge  
24 cultural transportation and pollution impacts to the  
25 citizens of North Bend and all along the pipeline be

PM3-43

PM3-44

**PM3**

**Continued, page 72 of 187**

PM3-43

The effects that the influx of workers would have on local infrastructure during construction are discussed in section 4.9. Impacts to traffic are discussed in section 4.10.1.2. Noise from the project is discussed in section 4.12.2.4.

PM3-44

The FEIS has been updated with the most recent information filed by Jordan Cove regarding transportation impacts and the use of offsite parking lots.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

73

1 considered, mitigated, and alternatives proposed, following  
2 the NEPA regulations.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Clarence Adams.

7 MR. ADAMS: Clarence Adams, C-l-a-r-e-n-c-e

8 A-d-a-m-s. I'm from Winston and I'm an affected landowner.

9 But tonight I'd specifically like to address the effects of  
10 the tsunamis and earthquakes.

11 In the DEIS Jordan Cove states that none of the  
12 30 LNG terminals in Japan were damaged by the 2011 quake and  
13 tsunami. They didn't mention only one of them was in the  
14 directly affected areas. Nor did they mention that one  
15 plant was also damaged and shut down for months, even though  
16 it's a small 80,000 cubic meter regasification plant. Right  
17 there is a trend -- or starts a trend of lying and deceit in  
18 this whole EIS thing.

19 The liquefaction plant will build on a 30-plus  
20 foot elevation, 20 of which will be on existing grade. And  
21 the tsunami variable will be in force -- will be buried of  
22 reinforced sand 46 feet above grade.

23 In the initial Japanese quake the shaking lasted  
24 for five minutes, with sizeable shocks afterwards. At the  
25 Jordan Cove site the groundwater is nine to 15 feet deep.

PM3-44  
Cont'd

PM3-45

## PM3

## Continued, page 73 of 187

### PM3-45

As noted in the DEIS, LNG facilities generally survived the Tohoku earthquake well although only a few were subjected to significant tsunami waves. However, there was one LNG facility that was badly damaged by 2011 Tohoku earthquake and tsunami, the Minato Gas Plant in Sendai. According to a statement by an official at the Sendai city's gas bureau, the LNG tanks were not damaged, but compressors, meters and other electric control systems went down after the quake, making it difficult to restart the facility within a month. There was not a safety hazard at the plant, just an operation problem. We have included damage information regarding Minato Gas Plant in the FEIS. Jordan Cove is required to design and construct its facilities to satisfy stringent design standards and codes that provide design requirements for geological conditions, including earthquakes and tsunamis. Also, the facility equipment would be either be protected or located well above the tsunami design inundation levels.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

74

1           There are two swamps on either side of the  
2 facilities. What happens when the ground around the  
3 facilities starts to liquefy and move?  
4           Even with site prep and proposed quake  
5 suppression measures, won't the massive weight of the  
6 facilities cause a sink when the sand and dredging material  
7 is moving out from underneath it? Keep in mind there's  
8 almost 300 feet of sandy material beneath the LNG terminal.  
9           Jordan Cove projects ground subsidence of eight  
10 feet. If you had any settling, how will a structure that  
11 has gone through five minutes of a 9.0 earthquake, and  
12 further stressed by subsidence and settling, be able to  
13 stand up to multiple tsunamis? Also, how much battering can  
14 a tsunami barrier take from a massive LNG tanker tossed  
15 around by the multiple tsunamis?  
16           Jordan Cove states a tsunami will reach the  
17 facility in 25 minutes from the source, only eight miles  
18 away. By my calculations, at a modest 50 miles an hour, it  
19 will take ten minutes for the wave to reach the facilities.  
20           Jordan Cove maintains a tanker will have plenty  
21 of time to undock, tie up to the tug boats, and meet the  
22 tsunami head on. The question is how fast can a very large  
23 ship de-couple, while filling, unhook from the berth, hook  
24 up to the three tugs, and get in the channel after the chaos  
25 of a 9.0 earthquake. That doesn't even consider the

PM3-46

PM3-47

**PM3**

**Continued, page 74 of 187**

PM3-46

Liquidfraction is discussed in section 4.2.1.3. As stated in that section, the facility would be designed to take geologic conditions into account. Jordan Cove would take adequate mitigation measures regarding potential liquefaction of the site soils to insure the foundations remain well founded during the maximum design earthquake. A recommendation is included in the FEIS to ensure these measures would be included in the final design. Regarding earthquakes causing the facilities to sink: We disagree. While up to a maximum of 3 inches of settlement may occur during the maximum design earthquake, it would remain well within tolerable levels of the LNG tank design.

PM3-47

Jordan Cove proposes to protect the LNG tanks with seismic isolators designed to accommodate the duration of Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake with no damage. At the dock, the maximum predicted tsunami inundation level is in the range of + 30 feet. The base of the LNG berm is at + 35 feet. The predicted maximum tsunami inundation level is not sufficiently high to cause an LNG carrier to impact the tsunami berm. The location where a predicted tsunami would originate is offshore and 25 minutes is the estimated time for the wave to reach the LNG facility site. The LNG load arms would have emergency disconnects and tugs would be onsite to position the LNG carrier. It is not intended to move the LNG carrier to the center of the Coos Bay channel. Instead an LNG carrier would remain in the slip but positioned just away from the dock and 25 minutes is sufficient time to accomplish this response. In addition, the Emergency Planning and Response Team for Jordan Cove, which comprises numerous agencies, including the Coast Guard, ODE, Oregon Fire Marshall, Oregon Marine Board, police and sheriff departments, fire departments, and Jordan Cove experts, has reviewed and approved the LNG vessel procedures for dealing with a potential tsunami.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

75

1 possibility of water being sucked out of the bay in advance  
2 of the tsunami, leaving all the ships high and dry.  
3 I don't believe LNG tankers were meant to be dry  
4 docked in that method and will probably be damaged even  
5 before the first tsunami hits.  
6 On page 4-254 of the DEIS there are six items  
7 that are submitted prior -- that will be submitted prior to  
8 the final design, including geotechnical data and  
9 liquefaction mitigation methods, seismic stability  
10 calculations, and design quality control and assurance  
11 procedures.  
12 NEPA states that all estimates of the project  
13 will be analyzed and subject to public comment. It appears  
14 none of these --  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: I have to ask you to wrap up now.  
16 MR. ADAMS: Yeah. You're right there.  
17 It appears none of these critical information  
18 will be available until after the comment period is closed  
19 and a violation of law. With the potential dangers I don't  
20 want to see Canadian gas being sold by a Canadian company  
21 through Oregon ground.  
22 Thank you.  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
24 (Applause.)  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Ron Petock,

PM3-48

**PM3**

**Continued, page 75 of 187**

PM3-48

This is not a violation of the law. It is standard practice for FERC projects to require specific information prior to permitting construction of a project. If the information is not sufficient to meet FERC requirements, the project would not be built.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 Steven Carlson, Ned Bemen, and Patricia ...

2 MS. GOUVEIA: Patricia Gouveia.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is Ron Petock here?

4 MR. PETOCK: My name is Ron Petock, P-e-t-o-c-k.

5 I live at mile post six, Catching Slough Road.

6 Luckily, my property is not to be affected. But  
7 nearby owners, my neighbors, will be if the residential  
8 route is the one that's to be chosen.

9 So because I'm not really to be affected except  
10 by road construction and inconvenience of trying to get to  
11 town, I'm not as prepared as some of the previous speakers.  
12 But here we go.

13 In Coos County it seems like there's either fire  
14 season or flood season. Along the proposed route many of  
15 the easy accessible ground -- Stock Slough, Catching Slough,  
16 Meskelee property, the Willis property, it's under water  
17 three months out of the year. These are very saturated  
18 coquille soils. If the pipeline is going to be made even in  
19 the summer time, there's going to be a lot of muck for those  
20 owners.

21 Okay. Then also with the flooded pastures  
22 there's the riparian consideration for all the baby cohos  
23 that are swimming around out there and not just in the  
24 nearby named creeks.

25 Okay. Fire season. As previously noted by Dee

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

77

1 Willis, one of our Sumner fire fighters, there's only six  
2 volunteer fire fighters on the Sumner Fire District, where  
3 the proposed pipeline is supposed to go through.  
4 We have a voluntary fire chief. But he's going  
5 to retire December 31st. And the lease of the fire hall is  
6 going to expire sometime in the near future. And so it  
7 seems to me, by what I've read in the paper, that Jordan  
8 Cove is not fiscally responsible for any major catastrophe  
9 like a fire caused by a leaking pipeline or just even during  
10 construction. I don't know if that's true or not. That's  
11 what I read in the paper.  
12 So it seems to me that if this is going to happen  
13 and the Blue Ridge route is not going to be the way to go,  
14 that some kind of fiscal responsibility by Jordan Cove needs  
15 to be addressed with the Sumner fire district, who is mostly  
16 voluntarily putting these fires out.  
17 That's all. Thank you.  
18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
19 (Applause.)  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Steven Carlson.  
21 S-t-e-v-e-n C-a-r-l-s-o-n. I represent 5000 carpenters here  
22 in Oregon and Southwest Washington with the Pacific  
23 Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters. I am currently  
24 regional manager.  
25 As Dave stated earlier, my first job in Oregon 25

PM3-49

**PM3**

**Continued, page 77 of 187**

PM3-49

The DEIS addresses impacts the Pacific Connector pipeline may have on local fire departments in section 4.9.2.6. That section indicated that Pacific Connector has produced an Emergency Response Plan, a Fire Prevention and Suppression Plan, and a Safety and Security Plan. In addition, DOT safety regulations require the pipeline company to coordinate with local responders. Pacific Connector would provide appropriate training to local emergency service providers before putting the pipeline into service. Safety measures that would minimize risks of fires in forested lands are discussed in section 4.13.9.1 of the DEIS. Off-highway vehicle (OHV) controls are discussed in section 4.8.1.2 of the DEIS. Furthermore, FERC is not proposing this Project, the applicants are; FERC is a federal regulator of the Project and the lead NEPA agency.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

78

PM3

Continued, page 78 of 187

1 years ago was the Alsea Bay Bridge out of Waldport. And,  
2 believe me, I'd still be there today living in Waldport if  
3 there was work available, jobs. It's a beautiful place. I  
4 love crabbing, fishing. I hunt, fish, I respect the  
5 environment and teach my grandchildren to do the same.

6 We as working craftsmen, we're professionals.  
7 I've built dams, I've built nuclear plants, bridges, big  
8 concrete structures all over the western United States.  
9 I've worked in five different states. We're transient; we  
10 travel with our contractors as crews.

11 This recent downturn in Oregon, our  
12 apprenticeship alone -- we had a little over a thousand  
13 apprentices in our program. At the peak of the -- at the  
14 lowest point of the downturn we had below 400.

15 So one thing it does do is that's the way I pay  
16 my bills, I put a roof over my head, I put my kids through  
17 school. Our organization last year -- we have our own  
18 scholarship program. We gave out \$55,000 in scholarships to  
19 our members' children and grandchildren of members. Those  
20 were all college scholarships.

21 And I don't disagree that, you know, we need to  
22 move toward cleaner energy. When I was a young kid growing  
23 up in northern Minnesota my mother's grandparents, my  
24 grandparents lived out in South Dakota. We were visiting as  
25 a young kid in the wintertime when it was real cold. In a

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

79

PM3

Continued, page 79 of 187

1 small town like that, I was always amazed at the size of the  
2 furnace in my grandfather's basement. And they all burned  
3 coal.

4 Thank God we don't all burn coal in our basements  
5 any more.

6 But we have to get to cleaner energy. Natural  
7 gas I feel is one of those steps.

8 I want to see those jobs here in Oregon for  
9 working families. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

12 The next speaker is Ned Beman.

13 MR. BEMAN: Ned Beman. N-e-d B-e-m-a-n, with  
14 Coos Curry Housing Authority.

15 I want to address an impact that -- talked about.  
16 It's the impact on low-income families that rent in the  
17 community that we have our vouchers for. And communities  
18 that have come into town with pipelines made for  
19 construction, small communities, it's devastated Section 8  
20 programs in the areas.

21 What I also want to talk about is how well Jordan  
22 Cove has worked with us to agree to help us financially to  
23 mitigate the impact on the Section 8 program in town. It's  
24 the first time that I can find talking with HUD that it's  
25 ever been done in the country that a private company has



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 80

1 worked with a housing authority to mitigate the financial  
2 impact of increasing rents because, as you all know, with  
3 HUD projects, my funding doesn't go up. When rents go up I  
4 can serve less people.

5 And Jordan Cove is going to help mitigate the  
6 difference in the rents. And I want to thank them.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

9 After Patricia is Dustin Clarke, Paul Washburn,  
10 David McGriff, and John Schofield.

11 MS. GOUVEIA: Patricia Gouveia. P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a

12 --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll read the names again. Dustin  
14 Clarke, Paul Washburn, David McGriff, and John Schofield.

15 All right, Patricia. You're turn.

16 MS. GOUVEIA: Patricia Gouveia. P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a  
17 G-o-u-v-e-i-a.

18 Good guess.

19 A gentleman earlier alluded to the fact that you  
20 are making a decision based on facts. I'm here to question  
21 how you're going to do that when a required section of NEPA  
22 has been completely eliminated from this document.

23 And the affected environment is actually the  
24 heart of a NEPA document. It provides the baseline so that  
25 citizens, FERC, anyone involved understands the impacts. It

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

81

1 gives you the information you need at the beginning of a  
2 project when that project is built, what happens to that  
3 environment.

4 That information doesn't appear in this document.  
5 And that makes this document invalid. It does not address  
6 how dredging the sediments would negatively impact the  
7 commercial oyster beds, putting the entire industry at risk  
8 in Coos Bay. Dredging would also impact the clam and crab  
9 industry, and our fishing industry. It would be the death  
10 knell.

11 Dredging those sediments would bring up  
12 contaminants, PCBs, tributyltin; in historical mining areas  
13 mercury is embedded in those sediments. All those  
14 contaminants would be exposed and become available to all  
15 our fish and biota and would destroy the fishing industry.  
16 That's not addressed in this document.

17 As far as FERC is concerned, there is no affected  
18 environment. And NEPA requires it. FERC needs to address  
19 it.

20 We need to understand what is going to happen to  
21 our environment to make an intelligent decision, to make  
22 intelligent comments. Without that information you don't  
23 know what's going to happen; I don't know what's going to  
24 happen. And that's fallacious; it's wrong. And it needs to  
25 be corrected.

PM3-50

PM3-51

PM3-52

**PM3**

**Continued, page 81 of 187**

PM3-50

The channel in Coos Bay has been dredged for many years. Information on dredging and disposal of dredged material is presented in section 2.1.1.12. As noted in section 2.1.1.2, the Port has already obtained an easement for the channel for maintenance and operation.

PM3-51

The channel in Coos Bay has been dredged for many years. Information on dredging and disposal of dredged material is presented in section 2.1.1.12. As noted in section 2.1.1.2, the Port has already obtained an easement for the channel for maintenance and operation.

PM3-52

While there are no headings that say Affected Environment, the affected environment, e.g., the current condition of the areas and resources affected, is discussed at considerable length for each resource section in chapter 4. For example, see the discussion on upland vegetation conditions on pages 4-28 to 4-48.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

82

PM3

Continued, page 82 of 187

1 Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Dustin Clark.

5 MR. CLARKE: Dustin Clarke. D-u-s-t-i-n --

6 Clarke -- C-l-a-r-k-e. Representing Coos County Sheep

7 Company.

8 We're affected land owners. And we own a small

9 third-generation tree farm outside of Fairview, just kind of

10 right next door. And we feel that there was an error in the

11 DEIS in selecting the proposed route over the Blue Ridge

12 alternative.

13 Now we are affected both ways, whether the

14 pipeline goes through the proposed route or it goes through

15 the Blue Ridge alternative, we will be affected either way.

16 But in looking at both, it seems very clear that what's good

17 for the community is to have it not only affect less

18 environmental impacts, but also less effect on the local

19 community -- people who live, breathe, raise kids in this

20 environment.

21 So let's talk about the two kind of things that I

22 think will make a big difference.

23 The first is the environment. The Blue Ridge

24 route crosses eight bodies of water. And we own a tree farm

25 and so we know a whole lot about fish and the effect of fish

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

83

PM3

Continued, page 83 of 187

1 and water. It regulates our industry a whole lot.  
2 We walk with -- I walk the streams on our  
3 property with OD&W biologists, with state foresters, with  
4 loggers. And it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure  
5 out that if you put the pipeline on top of the ridge you're  
6 going to affect less fish.  
7 And even the fowl, even the marbled murrelet or  
8 the spotted owl, mitigation can occur for those kinds of  
9 issues. And so the Blue Ridge alternative is definitely  
10 better for fish, and it's definitely better for fowl.  
11 And the second impact is on people. The Blue  
12 Ridge route crosses 23 parcels, private parcels -- private  
13 and public parcels -- let me rephrase it. The proposed  
14 route crosses 61. Forty is a lot. Forty more affected  
15 people is a lot. And these people are your neighbors that  
16 probably -- odds are -- don't want that pipeline running  
17 through the middle of there.  
18 There are significantly less on the Blue Ridge  
19 route, which runs through mostly public property. Again,  
20 public property, public good. Sounds right.  
21 There are -- in the Blue Ridge route there are  
22 6.4 miles of pipeline on private property. And there are  
23 7.5 --  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Clarke, I'd like you to wrap  
25 it up, please.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

84

1 MR. CLARKE: -- miles on BLM. So significantly  
2 more -- or, excuse me, let me rephrase:  
3 There are 6.5 on private, 7.5 on BLM. And on the  
4 proposed it's 12 on private and 1.5 on BLM.  
5 So let's --  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
7 MR. CLARKE: Let's --  
8 (Applause.)  
9 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Paul Washburn.  
10 MR. WASHBURN: Good evening. My name is Paul  
11 Washburn. And I live at 61829 Old Wagon Road, Coos Bay.  
12 The Williams preferred pipeline route crosses our  
13 property, located in a rural residentially zoned  
14 neighborhood. I urge you to reconsider your approval of the  
15 Williams route and to return to the preliminary finding you  
16 made a little over a year ago to follow the Blue Ridge  
17 alternative route.  
18 The draft EIS states that taking the pipeline up  
19 into ridges -- or onto ridges is preferable -- a preferable  
20 procedure in building a pipeline. Yet in this instance that  
21 preference is discarded without any hard facts.  
22 Your chart on page 3-28 shows that on every issue  
23 but one the Blue Ridge route is the more environmentally  
24 suitable one. It is shorter; it crosses less privately  
25 owned land -- including not going through any residentially

PM3-53

**PM3**

**Continued, page 84 of 187**

PM3-53

See previous responses regarding the values related to the number of waterbodies crossed by the Blue Ridge Alternative compared to the proposed route. Selection or rejection of an alternative route over the proposed route is based on weighing multiple factors and resource effects, and issues such as compliance with federal regulations (e.g., compliance with the Endangered Species Act, by minimizing impacts to spotted owls and murrelet) can sometimes outweigh numerous other resources that do not have associated regulations or restrictions. The FEIS contains a new Appendix (i.e., Appendix X), that contains additional details regarding the comparison of the proposed route to the Blue Ridge alternative.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

85

1 zoned properties. It crosses only eight water bodies  
2 instead of 65, which includes not going under Catching  
3 slough.  
4 It crosses less wetland; less agricultural  
5 pastures; less fish-bearing streams; and uses more buildable  
6 existing right of way than does the Williams preferred  
7 route.  
8 The only questionable issue is that of the  
9 northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet habitat. The  
10 information and conclusions here are suspect.  
11 First, the EIS says that the last habitat survey  
12 was done in 2013. A lot of logging has occurred on Blue  
13 Ridge in the past year. Is that habitat still where it was  
14 years ago?  
15 Secondly, when Williams looked at the Blue Ridge  
16 route it appears that they gave FERC one and only one route,  
17 not attempting to make minor adjustments which would lessen  
18 the impacts on the birds.  
19 Third, the amount of land involved in this  
20 particular issue is .4 mile, or eight acres. The BLM itself  
21 has done thinning in nesting site locations to actually  
22 improve the survival of the spotted owl. Depending on where  
23 the pipeline is located in relation to the nesting sites,  
24 there may be no negative impacts on the birds at all on Blue  
25 Ridge.

PM3-53  
Conf'd

PM3-54

PM3-55

**PM3**

**Continued, page 85 of 187**

PM3-54

2013 is the most recent data available.

PM3-55

The applicant can make minor route adjustments to the routes to avoid impacts. Development and analysis of the Blue Ridge Alternative in the EIS does not restrict the applicant from making minor adjustments to the proposed route, or from the cooperating agencies from requirement adjustments.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

86

1 Finally, I want to address the crafted bias in  
2 the conclusions of the Blue Ridge assessment. The 25  
3 property owners who will have the proposed pipeline go  
4 through their properties are passed off as -- quote -- "a  
5 group of land-owners." Unquote. No mention is made of how  
6 many there are, any of their letters to FERC, or their  
7 expressed concerns.

8 Yet seven people, none of whom have either  
9 pipeline route crossing their properties or even near them,  
10 are given special note -- even by name. Their specific  
11 concerns are spelled out not only -- their specific concerns  
12 are spelled out; the rest of ours weren't.

13 Not only are their properties not affected, but  
14 their concern about Daniels Creek is a red herring. The  
15 Blue Ridge route would in no way affect Daniels Creek.

16 With all of this considered, your earlier finding  
17 in favor of the Blue Ridge route still holds merit and would  
18 eliminate the need for 25 property-owners to individually go  
19 to court over eminent domain issues.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is David McGriff.

24 MR. MC GRIFF: Yes. My name is David McGriff.

25 D-a-v-i-d M-c-G-r-i-f-f. I live at 61869 Old Wagon Road.

PM3-56

## PM3

## Continued, page 86 of 187

### PM3-56

The group of landowners are identified in the DEIS because they are the group that submitted the alternative. It is standard practice to state who originated an alternative. See the text describing the route alternatives in chapter 3.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

87

1 And I'm speaking in favor of the Blue Ridge alternate route.  
2 As a land-owner, I will be directly and  
3 negatively affected by the original proposed pipeline route  
4 which will cross my drinking and irrigation water source,  
5 which is a natural stream that feeds into an earthen  
6 reservoir, which has been a water source for this property  
7 for over 70 years.

8 With this crossing of my water source I will lose  
9 my adjoining watershed. With this pipeline construction and  
10 clear-cutting, my water source will be lost or permanently  
11 damaged.

12 The Blue Ridge alternate route would affect  
13 approximately four private land-owners compared to 25  
14 private land-owners if the original route is followed. The  
15 Blue Ridge route crosses only eight water streams compared  
16 to 65 streams, including Catching Slough if the original  
17 route is followed.

18 My concern is not only the loss or permanent  
19 damage to my water source, but to the water sources of my 24  
20 neighbors.

21 As stated in the draft EIS, the Blue Ridge route  
22 is as constructible as the original route. The Daniels  
23 Creek property owners' argument about effects on them is way  
24 less than property owners on the original route. Their  
25 properties are not in the construction path if the Blue

PM3-57

**PM3**

**Continued, page 87 of 187**

PM3-57

As stated in section 4.4.2.2 on page 4-376 of the DEIS, there are points of diversion for surface water use within 150 feet of the construction work area for various uses including domestic uses. Pacific Connector would consult with the landowner if the point of diversion could not be avoided and identify an alternate location for the diversion prior to construction. Should it be determined that there has been an impact on the water supply, Pacific Connector would work with the landowner to ensure a temporary supply of water, and if determined necessary, Pacific Connector would replace the affected water supply with a permanent water supply. Mitigation measures would be specific to each property, and would be determined during landowner negotiations. Points of diversion (both public and private) beyond 150 feet of the construction work areas are not expected to be affected by the pipeline.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

88

PM3

Continued, page 88 of 187

1 Ridge alternate route is used.

2 Property owners on the original route will be  
3 directly affected because the pipeline will physically cross  
4 our properties and our water sources.

5 I believe the Blue Ridge alternate route to be  
6 more common sense because it impacts fewer land-owners and  
7 fewer private and public water sources and streams. With  
8 the original route my property's life blood, which is water,  
9 will be directly and permanently affected. If the original  
10 route is followed I will have no choice but to fight all the  
11 way through the eminent domain.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speakers are John  
16 Schofield, Richard Chasm, John Williams, and Bill Gow.

17 MR. SCHOFIELD: Hi, my name is John Schofield,  
18 S-c-h-o-f-i-e-l-d. My wife and I, Lynne, are affected  
19 land-owners. We live at 1868 Guber Hill Road in Winston,  
20 Oregon.

21 What I want to talk to the Committee on tonight  
22 is in the EIS it states that 68 percent of the land used for  
23 the pipeline for the Jordan Cove Energy Project will be  
24 privately owned land. In order to access this much private  
25 land the Jordan Cove Energy Project is relying on FERC to

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

89

1 relay the power of eminent domain.

2 To do so means that the Jordan Cove Energy  
3 Project must be considered a public utility under the law,  
4 and FERC must agree.

5 In its first proposal when it was an import line,  
6 I think that made sense. I think it did meet the definition  
7 of a public utility.

8 The legal definition of a public utility is  
9 simply businesses that provide the public with necessities,  
10 such as water, electricity, natural gas, telephone,  
11 telegraph communications. So the question is is will this  
12 project provide us natural gas.

13 Well, we know the answer is no. This is an  
14 export line meant for China with Canadian gas owned by a  
15 Canadian company, as well as some U.S. gas.

16 The Jordan Cove Energy Project may create some  
17 temporary jobs and 30 to 50 I guess lasting jobs here in the  
18 Coos Bay area. It may provide a return to investors, and it  
19 may make Canadian and U.S. companies some money. However,  
20 it simply doesn't fit the definition of a public necessity.

21 The general public of Oregon, Washington, and  
22 other affected states already have an abundance of natural  
23 gas. That's what all this fracking thing is about. We have  
24 the necessary pipelines to feed our homes, our businesses.

25 Therefore, since the Jordan Cove Energy Project

PM3-58

---

**PM3**

**Continued, page 89 of 187**

---

PM3-58

Comment noted. See section 4.9.2.3 for a discussion on the application of eminent domain.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

90

PM3

Continued, page 90 of 187

1 does not provide the general public with natural gas -- it's  
2 an export line -- nor is the general public really in need  
3 of natural gas, the Jordan Cove Energy Project cannot be  
4 considered a public utility within the intent of the law,  
5 particularly Executive Order 13406, which instructed all of  
6 the powers of the Federal Government, the heads of the  
7 agencies and commissions that it is the policy of the United  
8 States to protect the rights of Americans to their private  
9 property, and not merely for the purpose of advancing the  
10 economic interest of private parties to be given ownership  
11 or use of the property taken.

12 I'm in favor of creating jobs. Permanent jobs.  
13 But we can't be taking property away from legal land-owners  
14 to export gas. That's not the definition of a utility.

15 So my wish is, FERC, you re-examine your position  
16 on this and where you think you're heading with it. If you  
17 do approve this, it must be approved without qualifying this  
18 project as a public utility, and as such, without the rights  
19 of eminent domain.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

23 Normally I don't speak from the dais during a  
24 comment meeting except to clarify administrative actions.  
25 And I consider this an administrative correction.

PM3-58  
Cont'd

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

91

PM3

Continued, page 91 of 187

1           There seems to be some confusion about how the  
2 powers of eminent domain are conveyed to a company from the  
3 Federal Government. This was an act of Congress in 1947.

4           It's called the -- Section 7(H) of the Natural  
5 Gas Act. And it says that the FERC will convey the power of  
6 eminent domain to any company to which it issues a  
7 certificate of public convenience and necessity. And to  
8 clarify, FERC has not yet made that decision.

9           The next speaker is Richard Chasm.

10          MR. CHASM: Good evening. My name is Richard  
11 Chasm, C-h-a-s-m.

12          I've been going to hearings on these proposals  
13 for almost ten years now. Not one single time have I heard  
14 an opponent say 'We are opposed to jobs'; that 'We don't  
15 think that the unions deserve jobs.' Not one single time.

16          I am a union man. I've had a union card and  
17 withdrawal cards at Lumber and Sawmill Workers, Union Local  
18 2949 since 1971. I've been a shop steward. I've been in  
19 strikes and I stood on the picket line at Christmastime.

20          I am very sympathetic to the issues affecting  
21 people that are trying to earn a living as a union carpenter  
22 or pipe fitter or electrician.

23          Just once I'd like to hear someone from the union  
24 who -- and these unions -- I mean I worked with wobblies. I  
25 worked with people that moved to Roseburg because they had

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

92

PM3

Continued, page 92 of 187

1 to get out of Eureka because they had death threats from  
2 company goons.  
3 And the unions used to stand up for justice. And  
4 the unions used to stand up for working people that -- of  
5 all kinds. Just once I'd like to hear someone from the  
6 union say, 'These land-owners ought to be treated right.'  
7 That they should be well paid for a corporation to come  
8 through their property and do profound damage to the value  
9 of that property. Profound damage.  
10 The proposal as put forward uses the lowest  
11 standards of pipeline construction and pipe thickness in  
12 rural areas because we don't have a lot of people. But we  
13 do have a lot of trees.  
14 And I hate waving a bloody shirt: There's going  
15 to be some horrible disaster. But I've been in the woods my  
16 entire life and I have seen forest fires move. And then a  
17 forest fire moves to a cracked pipe, there's going to be a  
18 big fire. And that's going to hurt everybody. That's going  
19 to hurt the people that are trying to earn a living in the  
20 lumber business.  
21 There is plenty of work out there, plenty of real  
22 jobs out there building the infrastructure to be here when  
23 the big earthquake occurs. And I firmly support finding the  
24 work there to put my union brothers and my union sisters to  
25 work.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

93

PM3

Continued, page 93 of 187

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
3 The next speaker is John Williams.  
4 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is John Williams, J-o-h-n  
5 W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.  
6 I've been an environmental consultant for almost  
7 thirty years, evaluating environmental impact statements and  
8 air and water pollution permits for large industrial  
9 projects throughout the United States.  
10 I'm speaking here this evening on behalf of Local  
11 701 of the Operating Engineers Union, which represents  
12 thousands of working men and women who live and work in Coos  
13 Bay, in Oregon, some of whom are here tonight.  
14 For the last four years I spent thousands of  
15 hours studying the environmental impacts from LNG export  
16 terminals. I'm closely following the application processes  
17 for the 20 or more LNG export terminals proposed along the  
18 Gulf Coast and elsewhere.  
19 In August 2011 I was one of the first people to  
20 ever criticize a proposed LNG export terminal during an  
21 official public hearing when I testified against the air  
22 pollution permit for the Cheniere Sabine Pass terminal in  
23 Cameron Parish, LA.  
24 With over 20 proposed LNG export terminals, some  
25 are going to be built and operated. I'd like to see the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

94

PM3

Continued, page 94 of 187

1 very best proposals, the ones with the fewest environmental  
2 impacts approved. And in my opinion, air pollution is one  
3 of the most important impacts from these facilities.

4 And for that reason I have to support the Jordan  
5 Cove proposal. I am basing my conclusions on Jordan Cove's  
6 outstanding efforts to cut their air pollution to a small  
7 fraction of the air pollution permitted by FERC at other LNG  
8 facilities.

9 Jordan Cove is proposing an exceptionally well  
10 designed and far better engineered power plant compared to  
11 other terminals that have already been approved.

12 For instance, the Cheniere Sabine Pass terminal  
13 in southeast Louisiana -- which I opposed -- their proposed  
14 air pollution is more than ten times as much as what's  
15 proposed by Jordan Cove. A thousand percent more air  
16 pollution from the Sabine Pass facility than from the Jordan  
17 Cove proposal.

18 Cheniere has a permit to emit 7900 tons of air  
19 pollution from their LNG terminal. Jordan Cove is  
20 suggesting they will emit only 700 tons of air pollution,  
21 one tenth of the amount. Yet the environmental assessment  
22 for the Sabine Pass facility was only 140 pages long.

23 The Jordan Cove environmental review is 1,000  
24 pages long. You have ten times as much review for a project  
25 with only one-tenth as much air pollution.

PM3-59

PM3-59

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

95

PM3

Continued, page 95 of 187

PM3-60

Comment noted.

1 Thank you very much for the opportunity to  
2 comment.  
3 (Applause.)  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
5 (Applause.)  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speakers are Bill Gow,  
7 then Matt Hakki, then Carol Sanders, then Knute Nemeth.  
8 Bill.  
9 MR. GOW: Okay. My name is Bill Gow, G-o-w --  
10 it's B-i-l-l G-o-w. I live at 4993 Clarks Branch Road in  
11 Roseburg.  
12 I am a rancher and a member of the Iron Workers  
13 Local 29. I look around here and I see all the people that  
14 are out here spending their time being sucked into this  
15 process. And it really makes me sad. We should all be home  
16 doing something else.  
17 And this process has caused devastation in a lot  
18 of our lives. And it's just not right. The care that's  
19 been put in front of the -- you know, the forces are trying  
20 to run over the top of me. The whole process has just been  
21 a joke.  
22 Anyway, I'm different from the rest of you from  
23 the fact that I don't want this. I don't want anything to  
24 do with it. I wish I was home watching the National Finals.  
25 I don't have a choice, though. They came to me;

PM3-60



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

96

1 I didn't go to them. They came to my door and wanted to  
2 cross my property. I said no. They said, 'You don't have  
3 the right to say no.' I say, 'I'm an American citizen.'

4 They have -- This is a Canadian company that  
5 wants to use eminent domain against an American citizen to  
6 cross his property. You know, right there alone -- every  
7 one of us are Americans in here and every one of us should  
8 be up in arms about them going to use eminent domain to go  
9 across people's property.

10 There's another point that I'd like to bring up,  
11 too, that -- why don't we keep this gas here in the United  
12 States? Build factories, put our tradesmen to work building  
13 factories, and then we'll put American workers to work in  
14 those factories, and we all win. And we use the natural  
15 gas.

16 But for some reason it's more profitable for a  
17 Canadian company to run that stuff overseas because the  
18 market's better.

19 This isn't a -- this is a non-sustainable  
20 resource. It's not like something that's making more of.  
21 It's not like other products that are sustainable.

22 So for them to use eminent domain in this  
23 process, it's just beyond me how they can get there.

24 Since 1973 all we've ever heard about is we need  
25 to save our energy so this country can grow and prosper and

PM3-61

**PM3**

**Continued, page 96 of 187**

PM3-61

It is the Department of Energy, not the FERC, that regulates the U.S. Energy policy. See response to IND1-3.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

97

1 we have cheap energy. But it doesn't seem to matter in this  
2 process when the buck gets involved. They're going to go  
3 through two miles of my ranch, impact 26 acres. Take -- and  
4 they're going to give me \$14,000.

5 You know, it would be like me coming up to say,  
6 'I want to buy your tools for \$100,' and you said, 'Well,  
7 they're not for sale for 100 and you want 600' -- whatever  
8 you want. And I say, 'Well, you don't have a choice. I'll  
9 just take you to court and take it for 100.'

10 You don't have a choice. I don't have a choice  
11 of saying no.

12 One of the things that we all spent -- and I've  
13 been going to this crap for seven years, going to these  
14 meetings -- is we went to the scoping process. Our concerns  
15 were supposed to be addressed.

16 Not one of my concerns is in that EIS.

17 Oh, shoot, I'm to yellow already?

18 Anyway, in 1.1 of the EIS it address public  
19 involvement. In 4.1 it goes to some of the permanent  
20 impacts, but it really doesn't -- everything is blankly --  
21 if anybody reads it -- I don't know how many people you  
22 actually took. It's 5000 pages. They give it to us  
23 November 27th and we have to have it done by now. It's a  
24 joke. And right through Christmastime.

25 But anyway, 4.1, if you guys want to read it, it

PM3-62

**PM3**

**Continued, page 97 of 187**

PM3-62

Scoping comments were reviewed and addressed, but not necessarily in the way the comment wanted. For example, scoping comments requested that the EIS consider the impacts from fracking. We addressed this by explaining the fracking is outside the scope of this analysis and explaining why this is so.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 talks about permanent impact. That's what's happening to us  
2 land-owners. And there's nothing done. None of our scoping  
3 comments have been done.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Are you going to wrap  
5 it up now.

6 MR. GOW: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Matt Hakki.

9 MR. HAKKI: My name is Matt Hakki, M-a-t-t  
10 H-a-k-k-i.

11 I was born and raised in this community. I've  
12 lived here all my life with the exception, having left the  
13 area for three years to serve in the United States Army.

14 I became a journeyman electrician in '99 and  
15 traveled around to many large projects and have seen  
16 first-hand the impact they have on local communities, not  
17 only during construction but after as well.

18 I left my trade to pursue my dream as a  
19 commercial fisherman. I now operate my own fishing vessel  
20 out of Charleston, Oregon. I understand there will be  
21 escorts with the shipping traffic. I will be personally on  
22 the water with this traffic, and may expect delays while  
23 passing.

24 However, the impact it will have on our community  
25 during construction and the years after is far greater than

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

99

1 my minor delay. I'm one of very few who chose to stay in  
2 this area and raise my family. And I know personally how  
3 hard that can be.

4 We desperately need this project to happen to  
5 boost Oregon South Coast young families. I think that the  
6 vast majority of our aging community forget how hard it is  
7 for the young people to remain here and raise a family in an  
8 amazing area.

9 In closing, I'd like to make a comment. As a  
10 commercial fisherman who deals with the Coast Guard on a  
11 daily basis, trust me when I say that I guarantee our port  
12 and the LNG facility will be safe.

13 Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

16 Carol Sanders.

17 MS. SANDERS: C-a-r-o-l S-a-n-d-e-r-s. Carol  
18 Sanders.

19 I have two concerns about the draft EIS. The  
20 first, the draft does not explain to us the need for this  
21 facility. It explains Jordan Cove's need for this facility,  
22 but not ours.

23 We the people have a right to know the exact  
24 public need that requires the building and operation of this  
25 facility with its attendant pollution of our air, our bay,

PM3-63

PM3-64

---

**PM3**

**Continued, page 99 of 187**

---

PM3-63

Comment noted.

PM3-64

The EIS evaluates the environmental effects of the Project, not the need. The Commission will consider the need in its decision.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 100

1 and our cities for the benefit of Jordan Cove, a subsidiary  
2 of Verison, a Canadian company.

3 I'm also concerned because I live on the bay  
4 about noise pollution from the construction. The draft EIS  
5 says construction will take place over a period of about  
6 three years and may operate on two ten-hour shifts six days  
7 a week, with the possibility of a 24/7 schedule, if  
8 required.

9 The draft EIS says -- quote:

10 "The most noticeable construction activity in  
11 regard to noise would be installation of the open sail sheet  
12 pile wall and of the piles associated with onshore berthing  
13 structures, while the pile installation would be  
14 accomplished with a vibratory hammer. Piling installation  
15 activities would take place over approximately an  
16 eight-month period and are expected to occur on a daily  
17 schedule similar to that of other construction."

18 The conclusion on section states:

19 "Although some residents may hear the noise from  
20 construction, including pile driving, the construction of  
21 the LNG terminal will not result in significant noise  
22 impacts."

23 The draft EIS fails to address the effect of long  
24 term noise pollution and vibration from constant hammering  
25 for eight months, 20 to 24 hours a day six or seven days a

PM3-65

**PM3**

**Continued, page 100 of 187**

PM3-65

The impacts on air quality were evaluated quantitatively and conservatively, and GHG emissions were also quantified, in section 4.12. Health and safety concerns were addressed in section 4.13.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

101

1 week on the Southwest Oregon Regional Airport, its users,  
2 and the residents of Empire and North Bend.  
3 The draft EIS also fails to address the effect of  
4 eight months of pile driving on the fish of Coos Bay. An  
5 online document entitled Technical Guidance for Assessment  
6 and Mitigation of the Hydro Acoustic Effect of Pile Driving  
7 on Fish, prepared for the California Department of  
8 Transportation, February 2009, describes various effects of  
9 auditory damage to fish, including swim bladder rupture, eye  
10 hemorrhaging, and in some cases death.  
11 Please address these issues of explaining the  
12 need for this project to us, the public, and addressing the  
13 effect of long-term pounding noise pollution on humans and  
14 sea life.  
15 Thank you.  
16 (Applause.)  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
18 After Knute is Janet Stoffel, Jan Daley, Kathy  
19 Dodds, and Shannon Lenz.  
20 MR. NEMETH: K-n-u-t-e N-e-m-e-t-h.  
21 Measure 6.1 voted in November 6, 1990, air and  
22 water limits on future transfer of port lands. Question:  
23 Shall future sales and leases of Port of Coos Bay lands have  
24 water use and water and air pollution limits?  
25 Summary: Applies to future sales, leases, and

PM3-65

PM3-66

**PM3**

**Continued, page 101 of 187**

PM3-66

Pile driving will all occur on land and not in the water, reducing noise effects to fish to unsubstantial levels. See section 4.6.2.2 for discussion of noise effects from project construction.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

102

PM3

Continued, page 102 of 187

1 transfer of Port of Coos Bay lands. Limits water use and  
2 wastewater discharge to two million gallons per day. Limits  
3 reduced sulfide emissions to one ton per year. Air toxic  
4 chemicals cannot exceed state or federal law.

5 Permits Port to cancel contracts for breach of  
6 limits. Permits Port District residents to sue for breach  
7 of limits or enforce limits. Voters at a general or special  
8 elections may waive water use, wastewater discharge, and  
9 reduced sulfide emission limits.

10 This law is on the books. I do not believe the  
11 Port of Coos Bay has satisfied the Port electorate that they  
12 have met these limits. They are required to go to the  
13 voters before any more proceedings can happen. They have  
14 not met that limit. That relegates these proceedings to an  
15 illegal and renders this proceeding a moot point until this  
16 issue is addressed.

17 Thank you very much.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20 The next speaker is Janet Stoffel.

21 MS. STOFFEL: Janet Stoffel, S-t-o-f-f-e-l, Olive  
22 Barber Road, Coos Bay.

23 After teaching at North Bend High School for  
24 thirty years, I retired in 2005. I might mention after  
25 having been a Union president for several of those years,

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

103

1 and all thirty years being a Union officer.

2 I did not retire in order to spend my time  
3 fighting a proposed gas plant. However, I find myself  
4 compelled to still try to protect the youth and other  
5 citizens of this community.

6 In my public scoping comments in 2012 I expressed  
7 concern about North Bend High School and North Bend Middle  
8 School being within the blast zone of an LNG explosion.  
9 What a heart ache for this community if something were to go  
10 wrong at this proposed plant and the 6th through 12th  
11 graders of the whole North Bend community were wiped out  
12 sitting at their school desks.

13 Now with school district changes the kindergarten  
14 through eighth grade Lighthouse Charter School students  
15 would also be vaporized in such a blast.

16 I looked for mention of what I said in scoping  
17 about this explosion concern, and I find this draft EIS to  
18 be nearly impossible for the average citizen to use. I did  
19 not find any of my comments.

20 There is no index; just a broad table of  
21 contents. There are eleven pages of acronyms and  
22 abbreviations, making it nearly impossible to read without  
23 flipping back and forth to the acronym and definition found  
24 only in volume one.

25 I remember being embarrassed one year when the

PM3-67

**PM3**

**Continued, page 103 of 187**

**PM3-67**

The risk of an explosion is addressed in detail in section 4.13. See section 4.13.2 for a discussion of LNG accidents. Note that there have been very few LNG-related injuries in the U.S. Section 4.13.6.3 discusses the hazard zones for LNG tankers using the waterway and the terminal. The only area of land that would be overlapped by Zone 1 in the LNG vessel's transit to the proposed terminal would be a small portion of the western side of Empire and a small portion of the eastern side of the uninhabited North Spit. During transit, Zone 2 would overlap portions of the neighborhoods of Charleston, Barview, and Empire to the east and most of the North Spit to the west. Near the proposed terminal, Zone 2 would overlap the Roseburg Forest Products site and a portion of the Southwest Oregon Regional Airport's main runway. During transit, Zone 3 would overlap portions of the cities of Coos Bay and North Bend.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

104

1 high school students created a yearbook that did not contain  
2 an index. But a project like this prepared by professionals  
3 should at least be indexed for us to be able to look up  
4 specifics.

5 I cannot find out if the possible burn zone is  
6 still an issue, or if Jordan Cove claims they've mitigated  
7 the situation such that no explosion could ever occur under  
8 any conditions.

9 Having grown up within blocks of the Hanford  
10 Nuclear facility in Richland, Washington, and having lost  
11 both of my parents to radiation-related diseases, I know the  
12 government cannot protect us from accidental disasters. And  
13 neither will large corporations.

14 They can mitigate, but the truth is that this is  
15 a danger that the citizens here should not have to be  
16 exposed to in order for a foreign corporation to make huge  
17 profits exporting gas to Asia. There is no public benefit  
18 for U.S. citizens.

19 This draft EIS, according to NEPA, should be less  
20 than 150 pages, maximum 300. And it should be easily  
21 readable by citizens. These thousands of pages are nearly  
22 impossible for the average citizen to read and understand.

23 I believe FERC needs to throw this draft EIS out  
24 and make a new attempt to actually try to meet the NEPA  
25 requirements. If this draft EIS remains in effect, then to

PM3-68

PM3-69

**PM3**

**Continued, page 104 of 187**

PM3-68

The Final EIS will contain an index.

PM3-69

The EIS analyzes very complex issues. These include the LNG terminal, the 232-mile pipeline, 400 waterbody crossings, and federal land management plan amendments that would be required if the Project is approved. These complex issues cannot be adequately analyzed in 300 pages, as has been recognized by the courts for many years.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

105

1 expect the citizens to read and understand this document as  
2 part of their holiday celebrating in order to be able to  
3 comment by February 13th is absolutely unreasonable.

4 I request that 120 more days be given for  
5 commenting so those who have the ability to understand this  
6 complicated document may have adequate time to do so.

7 I do not excuse --

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap up.

9 MS. STOFFEL: -- the FERC for creating a document  
10 that is out of compliance with NEPA regulations. Come on,  
11 FERC, you must at least create the illusion that you are not  
12 in deep collusion with Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector  
13 pipeline --

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's time to stop.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Jan Daley.

17 MS. DALEY: I have a big problem with this DEIS.  
18 It is a study, isn't it? It is an environmental impact  
19 study. And I got the same impression that a couple other  
20 people did that you've already made up your mind because  
21 throughout the EIS you have statements approving things or  
22 biased to -- that Jordan Cove gave you the information.

23 Well, anyway, the way that FERC does not monitor  
24 what the applicant does before this approved EIS is out has  
25 led to over 20 permits that have been ramrodded through with

PM3-70

PM3-71

**PM3**

**Continued, page 105 of 187**

PM3-70 The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

PM3-71 The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 106

1 the help of city officials. And one example is the Simpson  
2 Heights 2100 men work camp.

3 The thing is that that project incorporated two  
4 of our parks there and all the trailways. But the applicant  
5 didn't give the 100 foot -- minimum 100 foot notice to the  
6 people in the parameters of the park, which is -- of course  
7 it wouldn't be 100 feet from the housing itself.

8 And also they did not put a public notice of the  
9 hearing in our paper, The World.

10 In this vacuum, making sure the citizens who were  
11 affected by it weren't there, the City of North Bend  
12 approved that permit and has been fighting an appeal that  
13 the citizens are putting forward. And it will be listened  
14 to by LUBA on January 8th.

15 And to the subject, here is what the DEIS says,  
16 4-1038:

17 "We conclude the project would not have  
18 significant adverse socioeconomic cumulative impacts.  
19 Population increases from the influx of non-local workers  
20 would be less than the average population increases in the  
21 four affected counties during the period 2012."

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: I have to ask you to wrap up,  
23 please.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next speaker is Kathy Dodds.

**PM3**

**Continued, page 106 of 187**

PM3-72

This appears to concern complying with local ordinances, not issues FERC regulates.

PM3-73

This appears to concern complying with local ordinances, not issues FERC regulates.

PM3-72

PM3-73

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

107

1 MS. DODDS: Kathy Dodds, Kathy with a 'K' and  
2 Dodds, D-o-d-d-s. I live in North Bend.  
3 This process of FERC and its EIS statement should  
4 protect the public interests and public needs as well as the  
5 environment. The proposed Jordan Cove project, the LNG  
6 terminal and pipeline, clearly have nothing to do with U.S.  
7 citizens or Oregon citizens. This is because the liquid  
8 natural gas is bound for Asia and not for the U.S. citizens.  
9 A foreign company -- Canadian as of now -- will profit  
10 immensely, while gas prices in the U.S. will rise.  
11 The proposed Jordan Cove project is placed in a  
12 tsunami subduction earthquake zone where an earthquake and  
13 tsunami are overdue, placing the people of North Bend and  
14 Coos Bay in extreme danger.  
15 The citizens of North Bend and Coos Bay live in a  
16 blast zone of an LNG explosion.  
17 This proposed project confiscates private  
18 property of farmers, ranchers, and other people by eminent  
19 domain, giving them no choice. How is this in the public  
20 interest?  
21 A private and foreign-owned company is to be  
22 given the right to seize private property of U.S. citizens.  
23 Eminent domain should be used only for public benefit.  
24 The proposed power plant would be one of the most  
25 polluting facilities in all of Oregon. This pollution will

PM3-74

PM3-75

PM3-76

PM3-77

**PM3**

**Continued, page 107 of 187**

PM3-74

The Commission would make its finding of public benefit in its decision-document Project Order. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

PM3-75

The DEIS discusses earthquake and Tsunami hazards, as well as liquefaction and subsidence issues, in section 4.2.

PM3-76

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

PM3-77

The impacts on air quality were evaluated quantitatively and conservatively, and GHG emissions were also quantified, in section 4.12.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

108

1 affect all of the citizens of North Bend and Coos Bay,  
2 increasing cancers, lung disease, and respiratory illnesses  
3 from the toxicity. This proposed plant would also emit  
4 greenhouse gas emissions, which negatively impact the  
5 climate crisis.  
6 Oregon has been known for its green solutions.  
7 Why in the world would we in southern Oregon want to go the  
8 opposite way?  
9 Thank you.  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
11 (Applause.)  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next group of speakers are  
13 Shannon Lenz, Jody McCaffree, Lars Christian, and J.C.  
14 Williams.  
15 MS. LENZ: Shannon Lenz, S-h-a-n-n-o-n L-e-n-z.  
16 Sorry, guys, it's another negative. What can I  
17 say?  
18 Okay. We are unable to identify any other  
19 alternative port location on the Pacific coast of the United  
20 States for an LNG export terminal that could meet the  
21 objectives of the Jordan Cove project and that would have  
22 significant environmental advantages over Coos Bay, which is  
23 from the FERC draft EIS, according to The World newspaper.  
24 I respectfully submit that the question is not  
25 whether an LNG export terminal should be built in Coos Bay,

PM3-77  
Confid

PM3-78

**PM3**

**Continued, page 108 of 187**

PM3-78

Section 3.1 assesses the "No Action" alternative (i.e., not approving the project).

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 109

1 but an LNG export terminal be built on the Pacific coast at  
2 all.

3 The Jordan Cove LNG terminal is a 500 acre poster  
4 child for climate change. Liquefied natural gas export  
5 terminals can dramatically increase foreign demand for gas,  
6 spur more drilling, and increase carbon pollution.

7 Projects like Jordan Cove promote investment in  
8 new unneeded gas generation capacity that can lock in  
9 reliance on fossil fuels for decades to come. LNG plants  
10 promote more fracking, enable gas development, and  
11 jeopardize public health, safety, and sustainable local  
12 economies in the U.S.

13 We in Coos County are concerned by the impact on  
14 the environment, the taking of lands for the proposed  
15 pipeline, the degradation of air quality, and the complicity  
16 and bias of our local officials in making this project  
17 happen at all costs. But most of all we should be, as  
18 American citizens, concerned with the short-sighted  
19 disregard of our own national interests. Exporting very  
20 important national reserves of gas and oil that future  
21 generations may need to rely on for the short term gains of  
22 a greedy few.

23 A Canadian company, Alberta-based Verison, is  
24 proposing to build and operate the Jordan Cove facility.  
25 Originally they made the claim that Jordan Cove was

PM3-78  
Corrd

PM3-79

PM3-80

**PM3**

**Continued, page 109 of 187**

PM3-79

Impacts to air quality are addressed in section 4.12 of the EIS. The FERC has no authority over the local governments or their decisions. The Department of Energy (not the FERC) has jurisdiction regarding the decision whether or not to export natural gas. It is outside the jurisdiction and scope of this EIS to make determinations regarding approval of gas exportation.

PM3-80

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 110

1 necessary to import much-needed natural gas. Now they make  
2 the claim that it is needed to export an overabundance of  
3 natural gas.

4 It is my contention that we did not need an LNG  
5 import facility then, and we do not need an export facility  
6 now. The Jordan Cove LNG terminal should be terminated.

7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

10 The next speaker is Jody McCaffree.

11 MS. MC CAFFREE: Jody McCaffree, J-o-d-y

12 M-c-C-a-f-f-r-e-e.

13 I'm very disappointed in this current EIS. None  
14 of our comments during the last ten years apparently  
15 mattered because this EIS contains the same mistakes we  
16 already noted in the prior draft EIS, and in many places  
17 it's even worse than the previous EIS.

18 There's a lot of things I could talk about. I  
19 will limit it to this issue.

20 LNG tanker ships have hazardous burn zones that  
21 would impact thousands of people living in the Coos Bay  
22 area, including hundreds of school children at Madison  
23 Elementary and Sunset Middle Schools. So why did FERC in  
24 this current EIS list the LNG vessels as non-jurisdictional  
25 facilities and make no plans to protect the public in the

PM3-80  
Cont'd

PM3-81

PM3-82

## PM3

## Continued, page 110 of 187

PM3-81

Comment noted.

PM3-82

See section 4.4.13.6 for a discussion of hazards associated with transporting LNG. As the incident history detailed in the section shows, LNG tanker incidents are uncommon and those that have occurred have not resulted in harm to the public. (See section 4.13.6.1).

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

111

1 draft EIS except for the Coast Guard's water suitability  
2 report.  
3 And now we are informed by the Captain of the  
4 port of the Coast Guard that they will not be following the  
5 water suitability assessment requirements that are necessary  
6 to protect us. This is not acceptable.  
7 Persons up to a mile away from a transiting LNG  
8 tanker would be at risk of receiving second degree burns in  
9 30 seconds should an LNG pool fire occur. The proposed  
10 facility would be in sight of the mall, schools, and our  
11 commercial airport.  
12 Hazardous zones of concern are mentioned on DEIS  
13 page 4-977. But FERC has provided no map in the current EIS  
14 of these hazard zone areas.  
15 The Coast Guard's water suitability report that  
16 only addresses issues in the waterway has been determined by  
17 FERC to be sufficient for protecting LNG transits. There is  
18 no emergency response plan, no protection on the shoreline,  
19 no protection of the airways, and no protection -- nor could  
20 there be -- in the event of an earthquake and tsunami.  
21 In fact, Randy Clark, a Coast Guard specialist  
22 with the -- a security specialist, stated recently in an  
23 article that -- he said, "I'm very skeptical that anything  
24 can be done in a near-shore tsunami to protect the tanker.  
25 There simply isn't enough time. There's no regulations.

PM3-82  
Conf'd

PM3-83

PM3-84

PM3-85

**PM3**

**Continued, page 111 of 187**

PM3-83

We are not aware of any decision by the Coast Guard not to follow established safety standards, nor does the transcript of the meeting indicate that the Captain stated "they will not be following the water suitability assessment requirements" as the comment states.

PM3-84

FERC provided this map in the 2009 FEIS, incorporated by reference into this EIS (see section 1.1.1 of the DEIS). The map was included as Figure 4.7-1 of the 2009 FEIS. More to the point, please review the accident history detailed in section 4.13.9.2 of the DEIS.

PM3-85

The Coast Guard regulates waterway safety, not FERC. It will make the determination on how and when the waterway may be used by LNG tankers. See section 4.2 of the DEIS for a discussion of earthquake and tsunami hazards.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

112

1 There is no requirement to mitigate this risk."  
2 So in other words, we're sitting ducks basically.  
3 The Coast Guard actually, by downplaying these  
4 hazards, saying they're not going to do the protection that  
5 -- even in the waterway that we need, is putting our area at  
6 risk.  
7 Proposed LNG project also places the Southwest  
8 Oregon Regional Airport and local air pilots at extreme  
9 risk. This risk is also not analyzed in the draft EIS, nor  
10 is the risk due to an airplane maybe hitting an LNG vessel  
11 or the facility.  
12 These hazards are not really addressed in the  
13 EIS. Actually, the EIS says there's no concern. So let the  
14 airplanes fly; we're not going to have any concern about  
15 this.  
16 The Southwest Regional Airport that is located  
17 directly the Coos Bay less than a mile from the proposed  
18 hazardous facility would be just an accident waiting to  
19 happen. The location actually violates the gas industry's  
20 own guidelines for safe siting of LNG facilities. We have  
21 brought this up time and time again. And it's basically  
22 just ignored.  
23 This is not in the public interest. This  
24 siting location is probably one of the worst ones out  
25 there, to tell you the truth, for safety and security.

PM3-85  
Confidential

PM3-86

**PM3**

**Continued, page 112 of 187**

PM3-86

We do not agree that the facility would place pilots at extreme risk. The FAA is responsible for airport safety. Their approval would be required, as disclosed in sections 4.10 and 4.13. See section 4.10.1.4 of the DEIS, including the recommendation in that subsection.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

113

PM3

Continued, page 113 of 187

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I know you want to wrap it up.  
2 MS. MC CAFFREE: Thanks.  
3 (Applause.)  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Lou Christian.  
5 MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you.  
6 My name is Lou Christian, L-o-u, last name is  
7 Christian, C-h-r-i-s-t-i-a-n.  
8 I am here tonight listening to the concerns of  
9 the community. I am one of the trades workers; I am a  
10 steam-fitter by trade that builds highly technical,  
11 complicated, and very hazardous facilities. Our craft is  
12 responsible for installing the highest quality pipe systems  
13 that are made in America. And we have the ability to  
14 install these systems safely.  
15 Hearing the depth of this EIS statement, a  
16 thousand -- over a thousand pages -- shows the length that  
17 this group is willing to go through to try to satisfy the  
18 concerns of the community.  
19 The whole community will never be satisfied. But  
20 the process and the procedures that we have to go through in  
21 this country today to try to vet everything as thoroughly as  
22 we can I believe are being followed here.  
23 And I want to commend you for a very difficult  
24 job that you have to do.  
25 Thank you.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

114

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
3 The next group of speakers are J.C. Williams,  
4 Suzanne Scheans, Anthony Meyrick, and Susan Smith.  
5 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. J.C. Williams. It's  
6 initials J.C., W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s. 66642 East Bay Road, North  
7 Bend.  
8 I'll have a beautiful view of the gas -- the  
9 electric facility that they plan to build for the gas plant.  
10 My concerns with the draft EIS are in Section 4.  
11 The info in 4.2 on geology uses a dogami map based on a 13  
12 year Cascadia subduction zone study done at OSU. That study  
13 concludes that we are currently at a 40 percent chance of a  
14 major earthquake and tsunami now, and that the risk goes up  
15 every year that it doesn't happen.  
16 One article said that by the lifetime end of the  
17 plant it's going to be at 85 percent.  
18 The very experts that did that study were  
19 interviewed for an article in The Oregonian June 26th of  
20 this year. This is a single sentence from that article.  
21 Quote:  
22 "I would say every one of us would be reluctant  
23 to suggest a liquefied natural gas terminal on the coast  
24 here--"  
25 Let me start again.

PM3-87

**PM3**

**Continued, page 114 of 187**

PM3-87

Section 4.2 of the DEIS discusses the risks of an earthquake and Tsunamis. The analysis includes the 2014 DOGAMI report.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

115

1 "I would say every one of us would be reluctant  
2 to suggest a liquefied natural gas terminal on the coast  
3 here."

4 So basically that was said by Anne Trahoo, an OSU  
5 geologist who studies the Cascadia subduction zone. And  
6 that's the end of that particular information for that  
7 article. But they would be reluctant to suggest to place it  
8 here.

9 I share the concerns expressed by Dr. Goldfinger  
10 and Dr. Trahoo in that article. And this draft EIS is  
11 inadequate in this area.

12 Section 4.14 on cumulative effects is sorely  
13 lacking as well. The following is from a piece just  
14 published in our paper December 2nd. It's titled Earth  
15 Since '92: 0.6 degrees hotter. More wild weather.

16 "In the more than two decades since world leaders  
17 first got together to try to solve global warming, life on  
18 Earth has changed, not just the climate. It's gotten hotter,  
19 more polluted with heat-trapping gases, more crowded and  
20 just downright wilder.

21 "The numbers are stark. Carbon dioxide emissions:  
22 up 60 percent. Global temperature: up six-tenths of a  
23 degree. Population: up 1.7 billion people. Sea level: up 3  
24 inches. U.S. extreme weather: up 30 percent. Ice sheets in  
25 Greenland and Antarctica: down 4.9 trillion tons of ice."

PM3-87  
Confidential

PM3-88

**PM3**

**Continued, page 115 of 187**

PM3-88

We disagree. Section 4.14 of the DEIS was prepared in compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

116

PM3

Continued, page 116 of 187

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap up.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

3 Simply put, we are rapidly remaking the planet  
4 and beginning to suffer the consequences.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: I have to ask you to stop now and  
6 let other people speak. Thank you for your comments.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Suzanne.

9 MS. SCHEANS: Yes. Suzanne Scheans.

10 S-u-z-a-n-n-e S-c-h-e-a-n-s, as in Sam.

11 First I'd like to thank all of you, Paul Frey,  
12 Steve Busch, Wes Yamamoto -- I think I said that wrong --  
13 Miriam Liberatore, and also Captain Dan Travers for coming  
14 out tonight and allowing us to speak on this subject.

15 I am a Union steamfitter. These are the type of  
16 plants that I build. I want to point out that I'm also a  
17 grandmother. And I want to assure you that we are as  
18 concerned with the safety and the professionalism of  
19 building these type of plants for our families as well as  
20 your families.

21 I have experience in ethanol plants, nuclear  
22 plants, all over the nation. I want -- We have experience  
23 -- and I have experience -- with one of the largest chemical  
24 plants in the State of Oregon, which is the Intel Microchip  
25 Manufacturers.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

117

PM3

Continued, page 117 of 187

1 Now Intel is the second largest employer next to  
2 the State of Oregon.

3 And I want to assure you that when these plants  
4 are built by Union craftsmen and women that we exercise the  
5 care and safety and seismic restraints that are needed for  
6 those plants.

7 I also want to mention that I live right next to  
8 a power line. And I really enjoy it when I can turn on the  
9 electricity and have that power in my home.

10 And I do feel very much for the concerns of the  
11 community. And I'd like to point out that the terminal is  
12 going to pay an average of \$25 million per year in taxes to  
13 Coos County. And the pipeline is going to pay an average of  
14 three million per year in taxes in Coos, Douglas, Jackson,  
15 and Klamath County. That's a tremendous amount of taxes.  
16 It can help pay for schools, police, fire.

17 And I want to thank you again for the opportunity  
18 to speak tonight.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

21 Anthony Meyrick.

22 MR. MEYRICK: Thank you.

23 Anthony Meyrick, A-n-t-h-o-n-y M-e-y-r-i-c-k.

24 And again, thanks for letting me speak.

25 And to everybody here, this is needed debate.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

118

PM3

Continued, page 118 of 187

1 And there's issues on both sides. And the property owners  
2 and everybody that's taking the hard stance about stopping  
3 the development and labor and a lot of other people that are  
4 pro, we share a lot of things in common.

5 I'm a fifth generation-sixth generation  
6 Oregonian, something like that. Lived at the coast. Been  
7 around. I'm an environmentalist. I'm a hippie, you know.  
8 I'm all for doing things the right way.

9 The trouble is is it comes down to someone's not  
10 getting compensated enough or we don't want it in our yard  
11 or what have you. We all have common issues that we share.  
12 We all have cars; we all have homes built out of wood.

13 You know, things that irritate me: The wood --  
14 you know, what we've got going on in the Coastal Range.  
15 It's not a forest; it's a tree farm. You know? That's  
16 offensive to me. And the environmental degradation done all  
17 the time to the watershed and everything else because that's  
18 the way we've always done it.

19 When we send our kids to college and they come  
20 back with ideas, let's listen to what they have to say.

21 With the safety issues and concerns, I work at  
22 Intel. I've done many pipelines. And if you do it right,  
23 things will be better. If you don't do it right you get  
24 what you don't pay for.

25 So do it right. Hold them accountable. Try and

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

119

PM3

Continued, page 119 of 187

1 get more money for your property. That's fine. But to  
2 stand in the way of development when we really do need it in  
3 Oregon -- natural gas is a transition fuel. And it's not  
4 perfect. But, you know, you want to burn coal? Someone  
5 talked about that. I burned coal in Utah; it's a nasty,  
6 dirty thing.

7 So we need the industry. We need the fuel  
8 transition.

9 Address your concerns. But when it comes to -- I  
10 didn't see too many young people from this area up here  
11 speaking against it. You know, if you don't have a job and  
12 all you get to do is work at a fast food restaurant or a  
13 Wal-Mart, that's not much of a future.

14 We do Union jobs. We make a good living. We  
15 take care of our kids. Both of my kids have been to school.  
16 And I'd like to see that happen for you folks.

17 We're not enemies. We're on the same side. We  
18 want it to be done safe and everything else. But it's going  
19 to happen. So, you know, this is something that we do need,  
20 and it does need to be done right.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

24 Here's the next group. It's Susan Smith, Bill  
25 York Dennis Copkin, and Lyle Landreth.



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

120

1 Susan.  
2 MS. SMITH: My name is Susan Smith, S-m-i-t-h.  
3 I would like to talk about Section 4.9.1.2 of the  
4 draft EIS, which addresses the impacts of the proposed  
5 Jordan Cove project on our local housing.  
6 I'm aware of three effects on the housing that  
7 the draft EIS does not address. The first, which was  
8 mentioned earlier, is price gouging in a rental market when  
9 the construction phase is on.  
10 Some of the boom towns in North Dakota have seen  
11 rents triple. Ours might not triple, but they could rise  
12 half again or they could double. Our most vulnerable  
13 neighbors -- those who are disabled or on fixed incomes --  
14 could be affected by this. Homelessness, risky living  
15 conditions, overcrowding and a strain on social services  
16 could result.  
17 The second point is the proposed worker camp.  
18 Studies have shown an increase in dating violence, STDs and  
19 car crashes with these worker camps. This was not addressed  
20 in the draft EIS.  
21 Third is impact on local RV parks during the  
22 construction phase. That also is not addressed.  
23 I read a report that said that ten percent of the  
24 people profit from projects like these and 90 percent of the  
25 people have to put up with the problems. I hope the final

PM3-89

PM3-90

PM3-91

**PM3**

**Continued, page 120 of 187**

PM3-89

To avoid pressure on the local housing market during peak construction periods, Jordan Cove is proposing to construct the North Point Workforce Housing Complex (NPWHC). Workers will be offered free lodging as a benefit of employment. The NPWHC and other housing issues are assessed in section 4.9 of the FEIS.

PM3-90

Additional information has been added to the FEIS, see section 4.9.1.2.

PM3-91

The effect on local RV parks is discussed in section 4.9.1.2.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

121

PM3

Continued, page 121 of 187

1 EIS acknowledges the impacts of the proposed Jordan Cove  
2 project for all of us, not just the ten percent.  
3 I'll follow up with written comments. I'll cite  
4 my sources. And I'll have them to you before the February  
5 deadline.  
6 Thank you.  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
8 (Applause.)  
9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Bill York.  
10 MR. YORK: Bill York, B-i-l-l Y-o-r-k.  
11 I think my comments are not as specific to  
12 chapter and verse in the draft EIS as I think many people  
13 who talked tonight have hit that on both sides and done that  
14 quite well.  
15 I think the real problem that I'm having with  
16 this is that there are many -- this is an analysis document.  
17 And there are so many misstatements and misinformation and  
18 all of this in the document. It's very difficult.  
19 This is why the people are having such a hard  
20 time with this. So how can we analyze something that  
21 doesn't make any sense? You know, we hear these -- well,  
22 let me move on here.  
23 Earlier this evening there were statements that  
24 encouraged us to believe in the professionalism. Well, we  
25 would love to do that. That would be wonderful. I think

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

122

PM3

Continued, page 122 of 187

1 that would be great. In the professionalism of the folks

2 that created this document.

3 Well, it seems that the result has done more to  
4 widen the distance between all of the parties here tonight  
5 than it has to bring them together.

6 So we've heard from many qualified professional  
7 folks tonight. Are they all wrong? On both sides? I don't  
8 get it.

9 Are their questions unfounded? Are the points  
10 that they've made misguided? How can the professionals that  
11 created this document have such vastly different opinions  
12 than the folks you're hearing tonight?

13 So I think science -- it seems that the science  
14 has really become incredibly subjective. And that's kind of  
15 sad. It is very sad.

16 I think the promises of money and jobs is hard to  
17 resist for any of us. We all want money and jobs. That's  
18 kind of the American way.

19 But the question is -- and I think, as it's  
20 always been -- at what cost. And the only way that we can  
21 analyze that cost is with a document that tell us what cost.  
22 And so I think my -- this whole process was created for  
23 analysis, and then later modified to include the  
24 environmental impacts. And that's why we are here today.  
25 That's what we're talking about today.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

123

PM3

Continued, page 123 of 187

1           So as we read through this document I think I  
2    would just request that the document be re-worked and  
3    resubmitted to the public for more analysis on the part of  
4    all the professionals that have given all their time tonight  
5    on both sides of this issue. I thank you all.  
6           I would just like to see the community benefit in  
7    all ways from this as much as we can.  
8           Thank you very much.  
9           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
10          (Applause.)  
11          MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Dennis Coplin.  
12          MR. COPLIN: Dennis Coplin. My name is spelled  
13   D-e-n-n-i-s C-o-p-l-i-n.  
14          I'm with UA-290, Plumbers and Steamfitters. I'm  
15   the director of political and legislative affairs.  
16          Now with that being said, I've been to many town  
17   halls on many issues. Everything from LNG to photovoltaic  
18   rays, solar, wind generation, hydroelectric. And you know  
19   what? I see the same objections and opposition to those  
20   same projects that everybody says here is our viable  
21   alternative to using LNG.  
22          The problem is is we have an emission problem.  
23   And if we don't do something about it we're just going to  
24   get there that much faster. On the world population clock  
25   we have 200,000 people coming into this world above what are

PM3-92

PM3-92

Comment noted.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

124

PM3

Continued, page 124 of 187

1 dying each and every day. They all have an insatiable urge  
2 for energy for every aspect of their life.  
3 Now with that being said, if we don't have a  
4 transition fuel to get from where we want to go to where we  
5 -- from where we're at right now, all we're going to do is  
6 get there that much faster. Ever environmentalist, every  
7 scientist is saying we need to do something about it.  
8 Now if we keep objecting to it, we've had over  
9 the last ten years over a billion new people come into this  
10 world. I don't know if the alternative is to say we all  
11 take turns breathing because we all put out CO2 when we  
12 breathe.  
13 Now we need answers. Everybody needs to work to  
14 the solution. Blind objection to everything I'm sorry to  
15 say it's been known as citizens against virtually  
16 everything.  
17 And it is true. Go to the town halls for solar.  
18 Go to the town halls for wind. Go to the town halls for  
19 hydroelectric. You'll see the same opposition.  
20 We need answers. Opposition isn't the answer.  
21 Thank you.  
22 (Applause.)  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
24 (Applause.)  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next group of speakers are

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 125

1 Lyle, Dick Lashley, Al Shropshire, and Rusty Meade.  
2 MR. LANDRETH: My name is Lyle Landreth. L-y-l-e  
3 L-a-n-d-r-e-t-h. And I'm going to yield my time to the last  
4 speaker, Dennis Coplin.  
5 MR. COPLIN: Thank you. I spelled my name  
6 before.  
7 Again, we are in the construction industry. I've  
8 been working in the field for 35 years. I'm an electrical  
9 engineer by education. I've worked all over the world. My  
10 primary career was working on emissions of large industrial  
11 fired equipment. And I'm telling you, we need solutions.  
12 We need to work together.  
13 If you spent just as much energy working with  
14 this as you do opposing this -- these projects, not just us  
15 -- projects -- we'd be further ahead than we are right now.  
16 Again, thank you.  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
18 (Applause.)  
19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Dick Lashley.  
20 MR. LASHLEY: Dick Lashley. D-i-c-k  
21 L-a-s-h-l-e-y. I represent Yellow Cab Taxi, Coos Bay,  
22 Oregon. It's a small company. We have about sixty folks  
23 working for us with sixty families. And I've got three  
24 comments and then a little wrap-up.  
25 First of all, I was very surprised to hear the

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 words 'blast zone' used together today. I thought that  
2 horse had been put away a long time ago. I will say that it  
3 is impossible for this plant to blow up. Period.

4 Second, the CO2 that we just heard about, natural  
5 gas is a transition fuel. It's -- T. Boone Pickens is using  
6 natural gas to transition to wind power. But if we only  
7 have wind power and we only have water, surf and that sort  
8 thing, the renewable sources that we currently have, how are  
9 we going to have lights at night? Are we just going to sit  
10 in the dark? Because we don't have the batteries.

11 We need transition fuel. China is suffering  
12 very, very deeply right now with a huge, huge air pollution  
13 problem. Well, that's Chinese so why do we care? Well, we  
14 have to care because that CO2 is holding the heat in, which  
15 is melting the ice caps, which is making Charleston closer  
16 to the water.

17 So that's another reason. If we are able to  
18 export clean energy -- cleaner energy to places that are  
19 burning dirty coal, we're going to have a much easier time  
20 to make that transition. At least we gain a little time,  
21 like this gentleman said over here. We're not getting there  
22 as quickly as we would.

23 Third, the earthquake and tsunami issue. We're  
24 going to have an earthquake. And the reason that we have  
25 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is to look at these

W-1778

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 issues and to mitigate the risks and to make sure that a  
2 company like Jordan Cove takes all the necessary steps to  
3 make sure that the risks are mitigated to the point that the  
4 project is worth the risk.

5 And why is that project worth the risk? The  
6 problem is worth the risk because I represent sixty  
7 families. Every month it's getting harder and harder and  
8 harder for those people that I work with to buy groceries  
9 and to pay the rent.

10 Economic development is only part of it. Jordan  
11 Cove is only part of it. That's part of the infrastructure.  
12 The infrastructure will grow from there. As the  
13 infrastructure grows my people will be able to support  
14 themselves without two jobs or three jobs. I have one lady  
15 working four different jobs just to pay the rent.

16 So this is a good project. That's all I wanted  
17 to say. And thank you very much.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20 Al Shropshire.

21 MR. SHROPSHIRE: Yes. Thank you. My name is Al  
22 Shropshire, spelled S-h-r-o-p-s-h-i-r-e.

23 And I'm the business manager of Plumbers and  
24 Steamfitters Local 290. And I represent 4300 plumbers,  
25 steamfitters, and pipeliners here in the State of Oregon.

W-1779



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 And I have to tell you that we are experts at building,  
2 servicing and maintaining large industrial projects and  
3 pipelines.  
4 We build these projects to the highest safety  
5 standards in the world. And we all in our local Union care  
6 about the environment, every single one of us. We all love  
7 to hunt and fish and go for a walk in the woods, ride a  
8 bike. And we wouldn't do anything -- we wouldn't trade a  
9 job for the environment. There's no way we would do that.  
10 Our state and this community is in need of jobs.  
11 This project will bring jobs and a boost to the tax base of  
12 both our state and this country and this community, and all  
13 the communities and counties along the pipeline route.  
14 The pipeline itself, which we've built quite a  
15 few here in the State of Oregon, will be built with the most  
16 modern materials and the most advanced welding techniques in  
17 the world.  
18 And I'm going to wrap up here just by saying that  
19 on behalf of our 4000-plus members that we want to thank you  
20 tonight for having these hearings and having all the voices  
21 heard. And we all believe that when all the facts are  
22 gathered that this -- that FERC will hopefully grant the  
23 permit. And we appreciate the process.  
24 And thank you very much for having us here  
25 tonight.

W-1780

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
3 The next group of speakers are Rusty Meade, Todd  
4 Gordon, Leroy Marney, and Dave Messerle.  
5 MR. MEADE: Hi, I'm Russell Meade, R-u-s-s-e-l-l  
6 M-e-a-d-e.  
7 I'm a member of Local 290, plumbers and  
8 steamfitters. And I believe that -- I think that Dennis was  
9 right when he said we need a step, some kind of stepping  
10 stone to improve the environment and the problem that's  
11 going on. I believe that LNG is that step.  
12 They're converting coal-burning power plants  
13 right now to LNG power plants, and I think that's a good  
14 thing. I think, you know, they're going to send this stuff  
15 to Asia, I keep hearing. They're going to convert their  
16 coal-fired plants to LNG.  
17 I don't know if a lot of people know that the  
18 winds that come over there, that affects us. So it's not  
19 just local; it's globally that we have a problem.  
20 And I feel for the citizens -- or the residents  
21 of Coos Bay and I hope that they get a fair shake out of all  
22 this. And we're not here to ramrod this down anybody's  
23 throat or nothing. We just -- we think that there's jobs  
24 that needed to be had in Oregon, and we think that this  
25 would be a safe and productive facility if it's permitted to

W-1781

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

130

1 go on.

2 We do hope that the residents get what they want.

3 And we appreciate your time.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Todd Goergen.

8 MR. GOERGEN: Hello. My name is Todd Goergen.

9 T-o-d-d G-o-e-r-g-e-n.

10 First of all, I wish to thank you for providing  
11 our local citizenry a convenient venue to offer comments on  
12 the draft EIS, the document regarding the proposed Jordan  
13 Cove Energy Project and Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline.

14 As a life-long Oregon coast resident, business  
15 and property owner, with locations in close proximity to the  
16 project, I have followed the permitting process closely for  
17 several years. I have, without exception, found project  
18 management responsive to any questions or concerns I or my  
19 family members have had.

20 After my review of the DEIS document, the  
21 Executive Summary, I concur and support FERC staff's  
22 recommendations to the Commission that environmental impacts  
23 can be mitigated to less than significant levels with the  
24 proposed implementation of the applicants' and FERC staff  
25 mitigation measures as proposed.

W-1782

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1           The economic benefits of this project are  
2 enormous and numerous. This project will provide rare  
3 opportunities for our community and the southern Oregon  
4 region, such as doubling our county tax base and providing  
5 dedicated revenues in lieu of taxes to support schools and  
6 other much needed services.

7           Our property is directly across the street -- or  
8 the Trans-Pacific Parkway from the proposed South Dunes  
9 Power Plant. And I attended the Oregon Department of Energy  
10 hearing on the air emissions standards. And it was quite  
11 interesting to see because we've had that property for such  
12 a long time, there was a pulp mill on that site.

13           And the emissions standard that were emitted into  
14 the environment were quite atrocious. What's proposed for  
15 the South Dunes Power Plant hardly budges the needle as far  
16 as toxic waste in the air.

17           So it's a big change. There's no other private  
18 property owner closer to the proposed site.

19           And thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

20           (Applause.)

21           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

22           (Applause.)

23           MR. FRIEDMAN: Leroy Marney.

24           MR. MARNEY: Hi. My name is Leroy Marney.

25           L-e-r-o-y M-a-r-n-e-y.

W-1783

PM3

Continued, page 132 of 187

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

132

1 I'm a field representative for Laborers Local 121  
2 and also president of the Lane, Coos, Curry, Douglas  
3 Building Trades. I have members that live in this  
4 community. I have contractors that live in this community.  
5 So it's not like -- it's not going to be a bunch of people  
6 coming from out of town taking local jobs.

7 It's going to provide opportunities for the  
8 people that are here; provide opportunities for some of  
9 these young people that don't have to move away to have a  
10 family-wage job with benefits. So there's a lot to be  
11 gained by this for everybody involved.

12 And I appreciate your due diligence with this  
13 DEIS statement.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

17 After David I'd like Melissa Pallin, George Logan  
18 and Beverly Sydnor and Robert Westerman all to come up so  
19 they can speak.

20 David.

21 MR. MESSERLE: Thank you.

22 My name is David Messerle, D-a-v-i-d  
23 M-e-s-s-e-r-l-e. I am speaking to you this evening as an  
24 individual intervenor and also on behalf of our family  
25 business, Messerle & Sons, which is also an intervenor.

W-1784

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

133

1 I am speaking with respect to the proposed  
2 pipeline mile post 11 to mile post 28 and the Blue Ridge  
3 alternative. I am in favor of the Blue Ridge alternative,  
4 and my company is also.  
5 We have a unique situation in that both routes go  
6 through our properties. The proposed route goes through  
7 five different tracts of ours and has a dramatic impact on  
8 our ability to graze cattle, raise and grow trees within  
9 home sites, and also within domestic water supplies.  
10 The Blue Ridge route goes through two of our  
11 tracts, but has minimal disturbance through pasture land and  
12 timber land. For obvious reasons, we're in favor of the  
13 Blue Ridge route.  
14 Now I share the sentiments of the prior speakers  
15 with respect to the Daniels Creek opposition. And the folks  
16 living there, as stated before, they're a long ways from the  
17 pipeline. And Daniels Creek will, in my opinion, in no way  
18 be impacted.  
19 With respect to the land-owners on Daniels Creek,  
20 they're cited in footnote 14 on page 316. And it says a  
21 letter came from Carrie Norman and Karen Doler on June 24th,  
22 2914.  
23 Now I respect forward-thinking people, but I  
24 don't know that 900 years in the future is pertinent.  
25 Understanding that that's obviously a typographical error,

PM3-93

PM3-94

**PM3**

**Continued, page 133 of 187**

PM3-93

Your preference for the blue ridge route as you believe it to be the less environmental impact route is noted. Responses were developed for all substantive comments submitted.

PM3-94

The typo will be corrected.

W-1785

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 134

1 but it may be indicative of accuracy throughout the rest of  
2 the report.  
3 And we find numerous inaccuracies in your table  
4 on page 328. And they're better addressed with written  
5 testimony. And that will follow either from myself or other  
6 interested land-owners.  
7 I want to sum up by saying that we are supportive  
8 of the project. And all the people from Boost Oregon, you  
9 have our sentiments. And along that line, I would like to  
10 ask you to respect our position and support our need for the  
11 pipeline to be on the Blue Ridge route.  
12 Thank you.  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
14 (Applause.)  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Melissa Pallin.  
16 Melissa?  
17 MR. LOGAN: Did you say George Logan?  
18 MR. FRIEDMAN: No. Melissa Pallin.  
19 MR. LOGAN: Oh. Sorry.  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Melissa Pallin.  
21 MR. PALLIN: I'm not Melissa, but I'm Curtis  
22 Pallin. And I'll be speaking for her.  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: You're speaking for her. Okay.  
24 MR. PALLIN: Yes.  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: So you need to state your name and

PM3-94  
Cont'd

PM3-95

## PM3

## Continued, page 134 of 187

PM3-95

Comment noted.

W-1786

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

135

1 spell it.

2 MR. PALLIN: Curtis Pallin, C-u-r-t-i-s

3 P-a-l-l-i-n. And we live on Catching Slough. And we are  
4 affected land-owners.

5 As the second generation land-owner and farmer,  
6 and one directly affected by the current proposed pipeline  
7 route between mile post 11.4R and 21.8, I'm here to question  
8 about the recently published draft of the Environmental  
9 Impact Statement. I have reviewed the EIS and am curious  
10 about the following.

11 In the draft EIS several land-owners'  
12 perspectives are accounted for in an argument against the  
13 Blue Ridge route, but land-owners' perspectives against the  
14 current proposed pipeline route that crosses from one end of  
15 my property to the other were withheld.

16 The draft EIS discusses the impact to wildlife in  
17 arrangements against the Blue Ridge route, but fails to  
18 mention the impact threat to human lives along the proposed  
19 route, including that of my family and my neighbors.

20 The draft EIS addresses the eight water bodies  
21 that would be crossed in the Blue Ridge route, but fails to  
22 mention the proposed route would cross 65 water bodies,  
23 including a major crossing at Catching Slough.

24 The pipeline will bore through one end of my  
25 property and through a major berm of Catching Slough Road,

PM3-96

PM3-97

PM3-98

PM3-99

## PM3

## Continued, page 135 of 187

PM3-96 All comments submitted within the public comment period for the DEIS will be published within the FEIS.

PM3-97 Table 3.4.2.2-1 lists the number of residents within 50 feet of the blue ridge alternative and the comparable portion of the proposed route. The health and safety of the public is addressed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

PM3-98 Table N-3 in appendix N identifies all waterbody crossings.

PM3-99 See the recommendation on consulting with ODOT and counties in section 4.10.2.3 of the DEIS.

W-1787



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

136

1 weakening the county road structure on top. I want to know  
2 how FERC plans to address the county road that would  
3 potentially be on top of the proposed pipeline route and how  
4 traffic will be limited due to the weight restrictions. I  
5 am concerned because many parts of our roads caved in from  
6 stand use yearly.

7 Liquefaction is not addressed in the draft EIS  
8 and I'm wondering how FERC and Williams propose to mitigate  
9 the situation when the pipeline already buried in unstable  
10 ground rises to the surface in an earthquake.

11 The threat to the community and my livelihood is  
12 not addressed in the draft EIS, and I am wondering how FERC  
13 plans to mitigate the potential loss of human life and the  
14 threat to my children.

15 FERC fails to mention the disruption of farming  
16 activities that would occur if the pipeline crosses 75  
17 percent of my property and how my livelihood will be  
18 affected.

19 It's for these reasons and others that I am in  
20 favor of the Blue Ridge route and urge FERC and others to  
21 join me in support of moving it to the Blue Ridge route.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is George Logan.

PM3-99  
Cont'd

PM3-100

PM3-101

PM3-102

## PM3

## Continued, page 136 of 187

PM3-100 Soil liquefaction is addresses in section 4.2.2.2 of the DEIS, see the subheading Liquefaction Potential.

PM3-101 Safety risks are addressed in the DEIS, see section 4.13. Health risks associated with air quality are discussed in section 4.12.

PM3-102 Impacts to landowners, including potential effects on property values, functions, and the use of eminent domain, are discussed in section 4.9.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 MR. LOGAN: Well, folks, I got to tell you,  
2 thanks for the panel and everything you're doing tonight.  
3 But you people in this room waiting this thing  
4 out, stand up and give yourself a round of applause on my  
5 three minutes, because you're all fantastic. And thank you  
6 very much.  
7 I've got to get my redneck teleprompter out here.  
8 My name again is George Logan, G-e-o-r-g-e  
9 L-o-g-a-n. And I'm representing Iron Workers Local 29 and a  
10 couple hundred thousand other iron workers throughout the  
11 United States and Canada.  
12 I've worked at a large amount of nuclear power  
13 plants, coal-fired power plants, gas-fired power plants,  
14 jet-fired power plants. And all it does is it brings money.  
15 That's all it does, for everybody. It'll make this whole  
16 area flourish.  
17 I'm sorry I don't have my green t-shirt on for  
18 supporting this project, but it had a 50 pound food blister  
19 in it so I didn't wear it.  
20 But anyway, thank you very much for this evening.  
21 It's a great project. And thanks, everybody, for tonight  
22 and toughing it out.  
23 (Applause.)  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next speaker is Beverly Sydnor.  
25 And after Beverly is Robert Westerman.

W-1789

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 138

1 MS. SYDNOR: I'm Beverly Sydnor. I'm a resident  
2 of Coos County.  
3 And I think there's one thing that everyone in  
4 this room can agree upon, and that is that the American  
5 worker is the best worker in the world.  
6 (Applause.)  
7 MS. SYDNOR: And I totally respect the  
8 craftspeople and professionals who have spoken about their  
9 commitment to safety. And I agree that -- I believe  
10 wholeheartedly in your commitment to that.  
11 However, where I disagree is that -- and I do  
12 also agree that we have to have a transition energy source  
13 as part of our plan to go to renewable energy in the United  
14 States. However, the current VIS does not meet the  
15 requirements of NEPA to the degree of analysis of each of  
16 the alternatives.  
17 And there's a map right here from the EIA showing  
18 natural gas pipeline networks that are currently in place in  
19 the United States, if anyone would care to look at this map.  
20 The infrastructure for the other 13 proposed LNG facilities  
21 is relatively in place in comparison to the proposed Jordan  
22 Cove project.  
23 And the DEIS is inadequate in providing an  
24 adequate analysis of the alternatives. A couple of brief  
25 examples.

PM3-103

PM3-104

**PM3 Continued, page 138 of 187**

PM3-103 The DEIS fully complies with NEPA.

PM3-104 See the response to the examples.

W-1790

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

139

1 The DEIS must detail and specifically address the  
2 impact of a proposed project on the health and well-being of  
3 infants and children. The current EIS is inadequate in this  
4 regard and I would ask that that being included in a revised  
5 EIS.

PM3-105

6 Also, the current DEIS does not address the  
7 pollution impact of the 90 proposed ships that will be  
8 traveling in and out of the harbor in a year. I would  
9 request that a revision be done that includes this, as it  
10 was in the DEIS done on the import facility.

PM3-106

11 Also, the safety zone around the ship.  
12 There's disparity in the discussion about  
13 property values. The study that's used to -- they talk  
14 about noxious facilities, they have to include -- because an  
15 LNG facility is considered a noxious facility, they have to  
16 include the impact on property values. And to do that they  
17 cite the Palomar study, which was based on 18 properties in  
18 a different state.

PM3-107

19 To make an appropriate comparison is required by  
20 NEPA, a study based on sales similar to the profile of  
21 consumers currently purchasing property in areas that would  
22 be impacted by the LNG proposed facility, including along  
23 the proposed pipeline route, 68 percent of which are  
24 privately owned, including also the impact on hunting,  
25 fishing, and the recreational areas of the influx of

## PM3

## Continued, page 139 of 187

PM3-105

We are not aware of studies that show that infants and children are either more or less at risk from LNG facilities. One possible exception is in relation to air quality. Some studies have suggested that children may be more susceptible to air pollution-related health risks. However, as disclosed in section 4.13, the project would be required to comply with all state and federal air quality standards.

PM3-106

Section 4.12 discusses noise effects and emissions of greenhouse gases by the LNG vessels. Sections 4.4 and 4.6 discuss effects of ballast water disposal from the LNG vessels. Section 4.13 discusses safety concerns of the LNG vessels.

PM3-107

Section 4.9 evaluates potential impacts to property values from the LNG terminal and pipeline. Studies cited include analysis of facilities located in Portland and Newport, Oregon (LNG storage), and Medford, Oregon (pipelines), as well as other applicable cases from around the United States. There are no examples from the area; therefore, the analysis cited similar examples from other areas.

W-1791

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

140

1 workers.

2 I think all these things need to be addressed.

3 It's the responsibility of the DEIS to evaluate

4 this --

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. I'm going to ask you  
6 to wrap up now.

7 MS. SYDNOR: Absolutely. Thank you very much.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next Group of speakers are  
11 Robert Westerman, Fred Jacquot, Cody Campbell, and Margaret  
12 Maddron.

13 MR. WESTERMAN: My name is Robert Westerman,  
14 R-o-b-e-r-t W-e-s-t-e-r-m-a-n.

15 I'm business manager, IBEW Local 932 here in  
16 North Bend, Oregon.

17 Earlier a lady had said that this is going to  
18 bring a lot of construction jobs. And it is. We're going  
19 to average about a thousand construction jobs over the span  
20 of the project and peak out at a little over 2000 at the  
21 height of the project.

22 But she had said that we're going to import the  
23 labor. And that's not true. We're going to use local  
24 electricians for this project. We're going to use them  
25 first.

PM3-107  
Cont'd

W-1792

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

141

1           This project is going to be built under a Union  
2 contract. And in my IBEW contract I have local hiring  
3 preferences. That means if you're an electrician that lives  
4 along the Oregon coast, you go to work on this project  
5 before anybody else, any other electrician from anywhere  
6 else does. So we'll have locals on this project first.

7           We will probably have to bring in some to meet  
8 the need at the peak of the level.

9           But we're also going to put a lot of our kids --  
10 or those that want to get into the apprenticeship program or  
11 become material handlers or get exposed to the construction  
12 and the trade, we're going to be able to put them to work on  
13 this project as well, at a starting wage of about \$17-18 an  
14 hour.

15           The starting wage of \$17-18 an hour here in Coos  
16 County for about five years during the construction. It's a  
17 huge benefit for this area.

18           I also -- I have one request of FERC. I request  
19 that you deny any further extensions of the public hearing  
20 process. This draft EIS -- we've been through this one  
21 before. Then Jordan Cove was an import facility they went  
22 through the process. And my understanding is 80 percent of  
23 the draft EIS is the same as we went through before.

24           Now with it being the same, I ask that you finish  
25 your work. You've done a fine job so far. Continue,

**PM3**

**Continued, page 141 of 187**

PM3-108

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

PM3-108

W-1793

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

142

1 because, really, we're ready to build this project.

2 Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Fred.

7 MR. JACQUOT: Yes. My name is Fred Jacquot,

8 F-r-e-d J-a-c-q-u-o-t. I live at 66097 North Bay Road here

9 in North Bend, right across from Haynes Inlet.

10 I am the chair -- the current chair of the South

11 Coast Development Council. And on behalf of the SCDC, I

12 wanted to thank the FERC environmental staff and the

13 collaborating agencies for their diligence and dedication

14 throughout this very robust and arduous process.

15 I agree with several of the comments that it's

16 been a long road and that it's been well done by the

17 agencies involved to date.

18 As a father of five and with a home overlooking

19 Haynes Inlet, I ask that you please site this project in my

20 back yard. I think the Jordan Cove Energy Project is

21 important to my family for several reasons.

22 Initially, when I grew up in the '70s and '80s I

23 remember growing up to the gas lines in the energy crisis.

24 I see now that potentially with the availability of

25 liquefied natural gas in our country we might be an energy

W-1794

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

143

1 exporter in 2015.

2 I'd like my children to grow up in an age where  
3 the United States not only is energy independent, but an  
4 energy exporter. I'd like my children to grow up in an area  
5 that actually has an economy that's on the rebound; that is  
6 not totally dependent on a timber industry or fishing  
7 industry; that has a variety of industries available.

8 And the LNG terminal will provide a new economy  
9 that we've not been a part of yet. And the spin-offs from  
10 that -- the manufacturing, the support businesses, the  
11 ongoing maintenance -- will provide many more than the 150  
12 jobs directly employed by the plant.

13 Overall, the opportunity for the community  
14 enhance plan to capture revenues from the project during  
15 construction and later into the operations phase will allow  
16 for local decision-making to impact our schools and our  
17 other economic development opportunities here. Instead of  
18 that money going to the state for decision-making by Salem,  
19 we're going to the county for decision-making to maintain  
20 simple public safety and so on.

21 With three million dollars a year for the four  
22 counties that the pipeline will go through, it's just about  
23 enough to balance the current county budgets in all four of  
24 those counties. And we'll shift again from the need for  
25 relying on federal handouts for timber payments to bring

PM3-109

PM3

Continued, page 143 of 187

PM3-109

Comment noted.

W-1795



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

144

1 back local economy and local control to our counties.  
2 So on behalf again of South Coast Development  
3 Council, thank you to FERC and the collaborating agencies  
4 for their hard work to date. Please keep up the good  
5 effort. I agree with the request to not extend the public  
6 comment period.  
7 We will make our written comments by the February  
8 13th deadline. And I ask that a decision call the process  
9 and conclude timely.  
10 Thank you.  
11 (Applause.)  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
13 Cody Campbell.  
14 (No response.)  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Cody?  
16 (No response.)  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.  
18 Margaret.  
19 And after Margaret we're going to do David  
20 Schmidt, Kathi Windsor, Rick Skinner, and Pam Plummer.  
21 MS. MADDRON: Good evening. My name is Margaret  
22 Maddron, M-a-r-g-a-r-e-t, Maddron, M-a-d-d-r-o-n. And I'm  
23 here tonight to represent the Clam-Digger's Association of  
24 Oregon.  
25 The Clam-Digger's Association of Oregon does not

PM3-110

**PM3**

**Continued, page 144 of 187**

PM3-110

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

W-1796

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

145

1 believe the environmental impact statement is a fair and  
2 honest evaluation of the impacts this project poses to our  
3 resources.

4 The Coos Bay fisheries are not fully recovered  
5 from past industrial uses, and fisherman currently are only  
6 allowed to harvest two coho salmon per year. In other areas  
7 of the state fishermen are allowed up to forty coho salmon  
8 per year.

9 The mitigation for loss of recreational  
10 opportunity is a joke.

11 The golf course property was not tested for  
12 copper contamination. Copper is the basic ingredient for  
13 all turf pesticides and herbicides. In recent years copper  
14 has been shown to be toxic to salmon in very low amounts.  
15 Why would we want to expose baby fish to this hazard.

16 Coos Bay is home to four or five proposed  
17 Superfund cleanup sites, which contain contaminants like  
18 biocide tributyltin, antimony, chromium, biocide copper,  
19 mercury, nickel, arsenic, benzene, creosote, and  
20 benzopyrene.

21 These contaminants have previously been found in  
22 shell fish and in the marine sediments in Coos Bay. Oregon  
23 DEQ has been unable to comply with the EPA post-testing  
24 requirements that were part of the Superfund clean-up  
25 deferral agreements. These tests that were never done were

PM3-111

**PM3**

**Continued, page 145 of 187**

PM3-111

A search of records of contaminants in the bay did not report contamination in this area. The applicant has conducted sampling of sediments in Kentuck Slough and values are below screening levels of concern (see Sediment Characterization Report Wetland Mitigation site Coos Bay Oregon by GRI Feb. 8, 2011, in attachment R53 of the Appendix Q of the DEQ responses).

W-1797

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

146

1 required to ensure that clean-up was properly done. There  
2 is no baseline for test information.

3 Because of these unknowns, we lack the credible  
4 science to go forward with this project.

5 The engineers who designed the Jordan Cove  
6 project have a disclaimer at the beginning of their document  
7 which states they never came here in person when they  
8 created this project. This speaks volumes about this  
9 project and the potential for unintended consequences.

10 We ask that this project not go forward until we  
11 have an environmental impact statement that addresses our  
12 concerns for contaminants and their effects on the Coos Bay  
13 estuary.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is David Schmidt.

18 (No response.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: David, are you here?

20 MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

21 David Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t. I live at 641 --  
22 or 61433 Daniels Creek Road.

23 And Blue Ridge Road has been for years an  
24 improved paved road which serves as an all-weather way to  
25 drive from Fairview Coquille area to the east side area of

PM3-112

## PM3

## Continued, page 146 of 187

PM3-112 Section 4.4.2 addresses water quality effects in Coos Bay. Sections 4.3 and 4.13 discuss contamination issues in relation to the terminal site.

W-1798

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

147

1 Coos Bay. It also serves as an escape, an alternative way  
2 for the people who live on Daniels Creek Road area should,  
3 as it does become blocked every year from falling trees,  
4 floods, and slides, which can for days leave residents  
5 without electrical power and a way to reach town via the  
6 Daniels Creek-Blue Ridge cutoff located at mile marker 4.9  
7 on Daniels Creek Road to Blue Ridge Road.

8 Blue Ridge Road is about five and a half miles  
9 long and only skirts Blue Ridge for about three-quarters of  
10 a mile on the westerly side, riding another ridge altogether  
11 from Sumner Fairview Road on the south end to Stock Slough  
12 Road on the north end.

13 Being an improved road, Pacific Connector Gas  
14 Pipeline LP cannot remove it. Pacific Connector calls for a  
15 fifty foot cleared-forever easement which cannot be paved or  
16 vegetation grown on except for grass -- if that -- to  
17 install a 36 inch underground highly pressurized liquid  
18 natural gas pipeline. No road could be put back on top of  
19 it.

20 Measuring from Stock Slough Road south between  
21 mile marker three and four, the ridge is barely -- if at all  
22 -- fifty feet in width. County map numbers of this area are  
23 township 26, range 12 west, section 27.

24 The slopes on either side are greater than 45  
25 degrees down and drop from 3- to 400 feet vertical and at

PM3 Continued, page 147 of 187

PM3-113 Comment noted.

PM3-113

W-1799

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

148

PM3

Continued, page 148 of 187

1 elevations of between 750 and 880 feet.

2           The proposed Blue Ridge alternative route, coming  
3 from Fairview area cross roads starting at -- the crossroads  
4 in Fairview start at 135 feet above sea level, only to sneak  
5 around the back side of Blue Ridge itself and climb to 1600  
6 feet in elevation, and by the communication tower area past  
7 the fire-fighting reservoir and down to the affirmation  
8 narrow ridge line on Blue Ridge Road, which from the start  
9 of Blue Ridge has already plowed through a mile of old  
10 growth and will go through another mile before reaching Blue  
11 Ridge road.

12           Looking and checking maps, the best I can figure  
13 original approved route follows an existing electrical power  
14 transmission line route, which is cleared and has plenty of  
15 room to add a pipeline without clearing --

16           MR. FRIEDMAN: David, you need to wrap it up.

17           MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

18           The original route barely goes over 250 feet in  
19 elevation and pasture land can be grown back over with  
20 grass, according to the lawyers of Pacific Connector, and  
21 cattle can graze and sheep, and everything else can graze on  
22 it, going around the original route.

23           Thank you.

24           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

25           Next is Kathi Windsor.

W-1800

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 MS. WINDSOR: My name is Kathi Windsor. 61433  
2 Daniels Creek Road. K-a-t-h-i W-i-n-d-s-o-r.  
3 We on Daniels Creek Road would like to thank the  
4 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for their due diligence  
5 in the matter of the modified Blue Ridge alternate route and  
6 their subsequent decision not to recommend its use. We  
7 wholly support this decision  
8 Due to limited time, let me focus mainly on  
9 Daniels Creek Road and reiterate both the impact and the  
10 hazards of using this road for access and for transport  
11 should Blue Ridge ever become a consideration in the future.  
12 Daniels Creek itself is no less than five miles  
13 of protected habitat for spawning salmon. The roadway  
14 crosses the habitat-protected creek continuously, and does  
15 this over antiquated bridges of light-weight construction  
16 and apparent disrepair.  
17 The roadway not only runs along the creek, but  
18 often along steep embankments without the bumper of guard  
19 rails, without the aid of street lamps or reflective  
20 markers. The mornings, evenings, and in dense fog can  
21 easily connect an unwitting driver with crossing wildlife,  
22 resulting in loss of life and spills into the creek.  
23 The road is fraught with hairpin turns, and in  
24 most of those areas are reduced to one-lane passage. A  
25 large majority of the roadway is an easement through private

W-1801

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 property, which would quite probably involve eminent domain.  
2 Daniels Creek Road is often unreliable due to  
3 cracked or fallen asphalt, and in the rainy season is  
4 frequently unpassable due to fallen trees and/or slides.

5 In emergency situations it is best -- or  
6 difficult to maneuver an emergency rescue vehicle on these  
7 narrow, winding roads. And, unbelievably, we have no access  
8 to a fire department for the protection of our homes, many  
9 of which sit mere feet from the travel surface of the road.

10 In addition to having to navigate Daniels Creek  
11 Road, traffic will connect to the Blue Ridge turn-off, which  
12 is BLM Road 261214. The Blue Ridge turn-off is all and more  
13 of the adverse conditions described on Daniels Creek Road,  
14 with two additions: All of it is steep. In some spots  
15 sheer cliff steep. The road is undeveloped in the respect  
16 that it is merely gravel and mud.

17 Once on Blue Ridge Road the topography maps speak  
18 for themselves. It is pristine old growth with a sheer  
19 vertical drop. It is unsuitable, unsustainable, and  
20 unconscionable, of which the Federal Energy Regulatory  
21 Commission can and has attested to.

22 The residents along Daniels Creek Road take pause  
23 to realize that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission can  
24 see what our own locally-elected officials cannot. It is  
25 indeed a sad day when the color of money cannot be

W-1802

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

151

1 distinguished from the green of an old growth forest and its  
2 irretrievable loss.

3 In addition to the loss of natural resource, the  
4 irreversible destruction of our way of life on Daniels Creek  
5 Road seems to rest in your hands and with your conscience.

6 To the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, we  
7 ask you to stand by your recommendation advising against the  
8 proposed use of the modified Blue Ridge alternate route.

9 Gentlemen, thank you for your time.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Rick Skinner, then Pam  
13 Plummer, then Wolf Schwartz, and Barbara Scharrett.

14 MR. SKINNER: Rick Skinner, Bay Area Chamber of  
15 Commerce president-elect.

16 You know, this process is all about identifying  
17 the benefits and adverse conditions of the project. We've  
18 definitely done that today. We thank you for this process.

19 I look at Jordan Cove as an ethical company. And  
20 they're going to do what they say.

21 Let's not let this project die of a thousand  
22 wounds. Ten years into this process there's got to be a way  
23 to mitigate any of the problems with this project.

24 I vote for Jordan Cove. Thank you.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

PM3-114

**PM3**

**Continued, page 151 of 187**

PM3-114

Your preference for the blue ridge route as you believe it to be the less environmental impact route is noted.

W-1803



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

152

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Pam Plummer.  
3 MS. PLUMMER: I'm Pam Plummer, P-l-u-m-m-e-r.  
4 I'm a local Coos Bay resident. And I really appreciate the  
5 process, and I really appreciate the collaboration between  
6 entities to bring together all this information for us.  
7 I just wanted to note some positive impacts of  
8 this project, like we had talked about -- many -- today.  
9 I welcome the jobs that it's going to bring. I  
10 welcome all of these local work force workers and those that  
11 will be coming into our community. You know, you're talking  
12 about the wages that you're going to be able to provide for  
13 these people.  
14 And I welcome you to spend your money and to come  
15 and visit my community and see what it's all about. I love  
16 it here, and I think that you will, too.  
17 I welcome the extra business that's going to  
18 happen because of this. I feel that there's going to be a  
19 trickle effect to local small business. There's going to be  
20 services that are needed.  
21 I know of many businesses already that have  
22 signed up as vendors to help as part of this project, and  
23 many of them are already seeing responses from Jordan Cove  
24 and -- Beach to be able to work on the project. I see it  
25 already happening.

W-1804

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

153

1 And I welcome Jordan Cove just in general. I  
2 think they've been a very good community partner, like Ned  
3 from the Housing Authority had talked about earlier today.  
4 They've already made pro-active steps to be able to help our  
5 community in support of this project.

6 The Community Enhancement Plan they have helped  
7 us to put together. I have hope now for the schools, for my  
8 children that go to the local schools that we might be able  
9 to help our community and be able to get money into our  
10 community that wouldn't otherwise be there.

11 So as a parent and a local resident and a local  
12 family, business owner, I support Jordan Cove. And I  
13 welcome the positive socioeconomic impacts that it's going  
14 to provide for our community.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

18 The next speaker is Wolf Schwartz.

19 MR. SCHWARTZ: Howdy. My name is Wolf Schwartz.  
20 Greetings.

21 I've been a Coos County resident most of my life.  
22 I want to know: Are we, the residents of this county, going  
23 to allow a foreign country to victimize us residents of Coos  
24 County by jeopardizing our health and safety.

25 2.2 million metric tons of air pollutants a year

PM3-115

**PM3**

**Continued, page 153 of 187**

PM3-115

The impacts on air quality were evaluated quantitatively and conservatively, and GHG emissions were also quantified, in section 4.12.

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

154

1 will make the proposed Jordan Cove LNG facility the second  
2 biggest air polluter in Oregon. This air pollution and the  
3 resulting acid rain will shorten our life expectancies. It  
4 will adversely affect our gardens, our livestock, our  
5 forests, our fish and wildlife, our bees.  
6 This air pollution will be absorbed and pollute  
7 the ocean and turn it more acid. From this acidity coral  
8 reefs will die. Ocean krill, a major food source for  
9 salmon, will die.  
10 I heard on the news this morning a young female  
11 killer whale beached up dead in Washington State. She was  
12 full of pollutants. Killer whales and humans are high up on  
13 the food chain and more prone to health effects from  
14 environmental pollution.  
15 The air pollution from Jordan Cove's LNG facility  
16 will require more doctors in Coos County to treat  
17 respiratory illness. The acid rain from the facility will  
18 cause corrosion problems to local buildings.  
19 Dredging the channel for the huge LNG tankers  
20 will stir up toxic sediments that will adversely affect our  
21 fish, clams, and oysters we eat, and our health. The surf  
22 at our beaches and the water in our bay will be muddied by  
23 repeated dredgings.  
24 Work on the proposed natural gas pipeline will  
25 also muddy local streams and rivers. Fracking for natural

PM3-115  
Cont'd

PM3-116

PM3-117

**PM3**

**Continued, page 154 of 187**

- PM3-116 The impacts on air quality were evaluated quantitatively and conservatively, and GHG emissions were also quantified, in section 4.12.
- PM3-117 Section 4.4.2.1 discusses disposal of dredged material, and it has been characterized as clean enough for open water disposal as per COE requirements; therefore, any sediments that may be stirred up will not be toxic. Page 4-384 of the DEIS identifies that BMPs will be used to minimize turbidity during dredging, and water quality monitoring will be employed to meet ODEQ water quality criterion during construction. Multiple levels of BMPs will be used besides silt fences to control run off sediment (see ESCP), in order to minimize erosion regardless of quantity. EIs will regulate construction and post-construction actions and procedures suitable for the conditions encountered to comply with state/federal permits. With many procedures in place to control sediment runoff, the goal is to minimize effects so that they are minor or construction is halted until effects are reduced back to minor.

W-1806

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

155

1 gas will pollute groundwater elsewhere.  
2 Then there are dangers of major catastrophes,  
3 explosions from LNG tankers running aground like the New  
4 Carissa and over 100 other ship wrecks off the Oregon coast.  
5 The Jordan Cove facility could blow up, burning many people  
6 alive and causing serious global warning.  
7 The natural gas pipeline could spring leaks,  
8 resulting in explosions here and there. All these favors  
9 are bound to have negatively impact our tourist industry.  
10 For all this grief the residents of Coos County  
11 should be compensated should the Jordan Cove facility be  
12 allowed to operate.  
13 Perhaps maybe we need a similar deal like Alaska  
14 oil companies have worked out with the residents of Alaska,  
15 granting every Alaskan resident a yearly compensation  
16 stipend. Perhaps a county ordinance granting every resident  
17 of Coos County a nominal sum of, say, \$15,000 a year for  
18 problems the Jordan Cove LNG project will inflict on their  
19 lives would be in order.  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Schwartz, I know you want to  
21 wrap up right now.  
22 MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay.  
23 If you allow the Jordan Cove LNG to go ahead,  
24 will we ever see a bright clear blue sunny sky again in this  
25 area. This area is blessed with a variety and abundance of

PM3-118

PM3-119

**PM3**

**Continued, page 155 of 187**

- PM3-118 See section 4.4.13.6 for a discussion of hazards associated with transporting LNG. As the incident history detailed in the section shows, LNG tanker incidents are uncommon and those that have occurred have not resulted in harm to the public. (see section 4.13.6.1).
- PM3-119 Comment noted.

W-1807

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

156

PM3

Continued, page 156 of 187

1 life and natural beauty. Why ruin it?  
2 Thank you.  
3 More pollution is not the solution.  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
5 (Applause.)  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Barbara Schamett, Beth Gipson, Tom  
7 Burnette, Amanda Listrom.  
8 MS. SCHAMETT: Hi. My name is Barb Schamett.  
9 I'd like to say I'm a Union worker, 20 years. I  
10 totally get the job thing.  
11 And I'd also like to say that I assumed you guys  
12 pretty much have made your decision. So if you get a sense  
13 of anger or hostility from me, please forgive me in advance.  
14 I have an open letter --  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Again I have to make a statement  
16 --  
17 MS. SCHAMETT: Go ahead.  
18 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- when someone makes an  
19 administrative statement.  
20 I think I've said it at least ten times today  
21 that the Commission has not made its decision. And I'll  
22 stand by that.  
23 MS. SCHAMETT: I totally get that. And I'm so  
24 stoked to hear it.  
25 And thank you so much for giving us the

W-1808

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

157

1 opportunity to speak.

2 My letter is entitled: Who's in Charge.

3 I have a quote from Franklin Delano Roosevelt in  
4 the 1940s. He said -- past President. And he said:

5 "The liberty of a democracy is not safe if the  
6 people tolerated the growth of a private power to a point  
7 where it becomes stronger than the democratic state itself.  
8 That is fascism. Ownership of government by an individual,  
9 a group, or a controlling private power."

10 I welcome you today, representatives of FERC and  
11 the United States government. And I appreciate this  
12 opportunity to speak.

13 I understand that you, FERC, have no jurisdiction  
14 or responsibility regarding the possibility of explosion on  
15 our local waterways and that some unknown, yet to be  
16 announced third-party investor will be involved. I further  
17 understand that Jordan Cove relinquishes any and all  
18 responsibility for any catastrophe, be it on the waterway or  
19 the land, in the event of some terrorist attack, tsunami,  
20 earthquake, or the like.

21 In other words, no one is taking responsibility  
22 for this project in its entirety. And this being the very  
23 first of its kind to be operational on the U.S. coastline --  
24 and I am not even allowed to drive a car without insurance.

25 What does NOAA say, the National Oceanographic

PM3-120

## PM3

## Continued, page 157 of 187

### PM3-120

These conclusions are not correct. FERC is responsible for the safe operation of the LNG facilities. The Coast Guard is responsible for the safe use of the waterway. DOT is responsible for pipeline safety. The applicant would be required to have insurance.

W-1806

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

158

1 Administration? There have been about 110 documented ship  
2 wrecks right off Coos Bay waterways in the last 150 years,  
3 the latest being the New Carissa, of course. I believe Sir  
4 Frances Drake turned around here, citing 'Too dangerous to  
5 continue' on his search for the Northwest passage in the  
6 1500s.

7 Anyone who knows the southern Oregon coastline  
8 can tell you it is one of the most dangerous in the world.

9 The Jordan Cove project plans to release at least  
10 2.2 million tons of additional carbon, CO2, greenhouse  
11 gases, as you've heard, per year here at Coos Bay and into  
12 our atmosphere. It supports chemical fracking and  
13 contamination of water sheds elsewhere in the United States.

14 Our ecosystem cannot possibly absorb further  
15 damage without increased climate-induced catastrophic  
16 events. We have already lost 50 percent of our ocean life  
17 in the last fifty years. And these carbon levels are higher  
18 in the planet than ever before in human existence. Our  
19 life-sustaining systems are critically threatened by  
20 continued greed, exploitation, overuse and waste of natural  
21 resources.

22 May I remind us -- and with all due respect --  
23 this project which our government and FERC representatives  
24 tentatively may accept is in violation of, number one, our  
25 Constitution of the United States and of the Bill of Rights,

PM3 Continued, page 158 of 187

PM3-121 Comment noted.

PM3-121

W-1810

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 guaranteeing and ensuring every American citizen's domestic  
2 tranquility, freedom from tyranny, and promotes the general  
3 welfare.

4 Number two --

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Barbara, I know you want to wrap  
6 it up now.

7 MS. SCHAMETT: Oh.

8 It is a violation of the Clean Air Act, the Clean  
9 Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Human Rights Act,  
10 and -- boy, oh, boy, could I go on.

11 Anyway, it's a no-brainer.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Beth Gipson.

15 MS. GIBSON: Beth Gipson. B-e-t-h G-i-p -- as in  
16 Paul -- s-o-n.

17 I want to thank you for taking the time to listen  
18 to us tonight. And I have read through the Executive  
19 Summary of the draft EIS and I support its conclusions.

20 My husband and I have lived here for a little  
21 over 17 years. We own a small business in North Bend that  
22 won't be directly affected by the influx of jobs, et cetera,  
23 et cetera. I think it will be good for all businesses in  
24 the long run. But we're not going to see a direct economic  
25 benefit from this.

W-1811



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

160

1 We also live in Airport Heights. So we will, you  
2 know, possibly actually be looking across the water at some  
3 of the lights and the power plant and all that. We already  
4 hear the Coast Guard helicopters; we already hear the  
5 airplanes coming and going.

6 We thrilled to see this project move forward.

7 One of the things that we've seen in our business  
8 over the last 17 years is that we're losing the young people  
9 in the families from our area. And they're not people that  
10 want to move away. They're people that cannot find a way to  
11 make a living and support their family in this area. And I  
12 think it's really, really important that we take a look at  
13 that.

14 I also feel that Jordan Cove has really shown us  
15 that they're willing to reinvest in our community through  
16 the CEP. That money is I think critical to our local  
17 schools simply because they're falling apart. And if you've  
18 ever been on a tour of some of our schools, it's kind of  
19 horrifying that we send our children there at all.

20 I think Jordan Cove is the opportunity that our  
21 area needs. It can be the catalyst for an economic recovery  
22 that we've been looking for for much longer than I've lived  
23 here.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

PM3

Continued, page 160 of 187

PM3-122

Comment noted.

PM3-122

W-1812

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Tom Burnett.  
3 (No response.)  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Tom?  
5 (No response.)  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Amanda Listrom, then Barbara  
7 Gimlin, then Mark Wall.  
8 Amanda.  
9 (No response.)  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Barbara Gimlin.  
11 Yes?  
12 (No Response.)  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Then Mark Wall and then Pam  
14 DeJoang, and then Janet Andrews.  
15 MS. GIMLIN: It's Barbara Gimlin, B-a-r-b-a-r-a  
16 G-i-m-l-i-n.  
17 And I've been a resident of North Bend for about  
18 ten years. And I come with a background. I'm a biologist  
19 and I've worked with environment Mental Education, as a  
20 contract biologist.  
21 And finally, I went and worked 15 years with FEMA  
22 as an environmental specialist. I've had extensive training  
23 in NEPA -- the National Environmental Policy Act, and all  
24 the -- ensuring that the whole premise of NEPA is followed.  
25 In March of 2013 I left FEMA and I decided to

W-1813

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

162

1 work locally. And I had an opportunity to go with a local  
2 engineering firm and to work on the Jordan Cove Energy  
3 Project. I helped with the fish, wildlife, and vegetation  
4 portion, including endangered species.

5 This is a huge project. It's not -- I support  
6 the project, but I don't support what I saw in the content  
7 of the draft environmental impact statement.

8 You've got kentuck -- that they say that they  
9 want to open up the tidal wetlands. And they're not even --  
10 you know, for a type that wasn't that long ago put in.

11 And there's wetlands being filled three miles up  
12 the valley. They haven't studied the hydrology.

13 And I don't see the environment -- like the  
14 Clam-Digging Association. Have they really looked at those  
15 contaminants?

16 You've got a Point Reyes birds-beak, a  
17 state-endangered plant that's along the shorelines of Jordan  
18 Cove. And in the EIS it says that it's the direct  
19 mortality.

20 I worked on that. I did surveys. I know where  
21 they are. And it's like it's just going to be direct  
22 mortality now? Although the pipeline said that they take  
23 concern. And the North Point workforce housing has them  
24 along there. Why isn't that included?

25 There's a lot of missing information.

PM3-123

PM3-124

**PM3**

**Continued, page 162 of 187**

PM3-123 See response to IND53-7.

PM3-124 The EIS discloses that this species is located along the portion of the Project adjacent to Coos Bay (as indicated in this comment). This comment does not provide any new information not already contained in the EIS.

W-1814

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

163

1 But my primary concern is the contaminants at the  
2 Ingram yard and along the shoreline from the Weyerhaeuser  
3 mill site. I left my job because of that, because I named  
4 the acting environmental inspector for a Kiewit test program  
5 that occurred there this last spring, a \$15 million test  
6 program at the site that was allowed to go on.

7 And I saw early on the DEQ permit didn't permit  
8 application, didn't adequately -- didn't honestly say that  
9 there was -- it said that there was a paved access shoreline  
10 road. They said, 'Let's wait and see if it comes out in  
11 public comment.' Didn't.

12 DEQ isn't really known for compliance monitoring.  
13 I guess they don't go out to look at the sites. The NIMS  
14 standards are that you -- the staging area is 150 feet up;  
15 that should be -- Okay.

16 But the big thing is is that that site is an  
17 environmental clean-up site and I didn't realize that. I  
18 was told it was clean fill. It has bioaccumulating toxins  
19 that need to be transported off the site, not to the South  
20 Dunes Power Plant site where they plan to fill it 20 to 30  
21 feet.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mark Wall.

25 MR. WALL: Right here.

PM3-125

**PM3**

**Continued, page 163 of 187**

PM3-125 The comment concerns DEQ oversight. This is not a FERC issue.

W-1815

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

164

1 My name is Mark Wall, M-a-r-k W-a-l-l. I am  
2 co-chair of Boost Southwest Oregon. I represent a thousand  
3 individuals and 125 companies that have endorsed this  
4 project. I'd like to thank all the Boosters that were here  
5 tonight and are still here. Thank you.

6 I've read the Executive Summary of the draft EIS.  
7 And I would simply like to state that I concur with your  
8 major conclusions. It's a 5000 page document. I can't  
9 believe the depth of analysis on every conceivable  
10 environmental issue imaginable. It's a very thorough  
11 document.

12 This is the second go-around for this project and  
13 the pipeline. Ten-plus years in the making, \$150  
14 million-plus spent on the environmental studies and  
15 engineering that -- a large part of what went into that  
16 draft EIS.

17 I think it's time to build this project. I don't  
18 want to see any further delays in the public process that  
19 we're going through right now. People do have plenty of  
20 time to comment.

21 And I ask that you just move forward on the  
22 timeline that you have already put out there.

23 Finally, we heard a number of concerns from folks  
24 about the Blue Ridge alternative route that was proposed.  
25 And as a forester, I support it, that alternative route; and

PM3

Continued, page 164 of 187

PM3-126

Your preference for the blue ridge route as you believe it to be the less environmental impact route is noted.

PM3-126

W-1816

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

165

PM3

Continued, page 165 of 187

1 was, frankly, surprised that you chose to go with the  
2 existing route. And I would just ask that you take another  
3 look at that.

4 If the environmental consequences are so  
5 significant that it needs to stay with the existing route,  
6 then so be it. But if the environmental consequences are  
7 balanced, then maybe we should go with the alternative route  
8 in favor of people and not so much the owls and murrelets,  
9 which I believe is the primary concern on the alternative  
10 route.

11 So thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

14 Pam DeJong.

15 MS. DE JONG: Yes.

16 Hi. My name is Pam DeJong. And that's P-a-m  
17 D-e-space-capital J-o-n-g.

18 I thank everybody for coming. But most  
19 importantly, thank you for giving us the opportunity to have  
20 this conversation this evening and hear all sides.

21 I live in North Bend, and have for eight years.  
22 I'm a worker, just like everyone else. And I'd like to see  
23 some growth in this community. And I think it's our turn to  
24 have some influx of business. I think it's our turn that  
25 we're an exporter instead of an importer.

PM3-126  
Conf'd

W-1817

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1           And I really feel that it's important that we  
2   keep in mind people that are involved in this. And the  
3   multiplier effect that happens when eight billion dollars  
4   rolls through a community and what that actually means.  
5           That means not just that people are going to get  
6   a \$17 wage; it's what are they doing to do with that money.  
7   They're going to spend it in our community. They're going  
8   to go and pay permit fees to camp or fish. They're going to  
9   go to restaurants. They're going to rent ATVs.  
10          They're going to have a good time here and spend  
11   the money that they're earning over and over again. Those  
12   businesses that get that money, they're going to pay their  
13   wages to their people.  
14          That money is going to get spent again and again  
15   and again. So it's a lot more than just somebody getting  
16   \$17; that \$17 is going to be spent multiple times right here  
17   in this community.  
18          It's our turn to have that kind of business hit  
19   our county.  
20          Thank you so much for your time. And thank you  
21   for coming.  
22          (Applause.)  
23          MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
24          The next group of speakers are Janet Andrews,  
25   Mike Graybill, John Keikirk, and Fred Messerle.

W-1818

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

167

1 Janet?  
2 (No response.)  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Here? Not here?  
4 (No response.)  
5 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.  
6 Mike Graybill.  
7 MR. GRAYBILL: Hi. My name's Mike Graybill,  
8 G-r-a-y-b-i-l-l.  
9 As far as I can see, this project has -- you can  
10 boil it down to five major pieces. One is a pipeline.  
11 Another one is a place to chill the gas that's coming out of  
12 the pipeline to a liquid. There's an electrical power plant  
13 to supply electricity. And there's a terminal that parks a  
14 boat that receives liquid gas. And then there's also a  
15 terminal for an as-yet unspecified use that sits just to the  
16 west of that.  
17 The draft EIS looks fairly critically at two of  
18 those five pieces. And not surprisingly, because FERC has  
19 jurisdiction over it, it looks like it reviews the pipeline  
20 and the chilling facility. But FERC doesn't have  
21 jurisdiction over the electrical generating plant or the  
22 actual -- or the EIS gives less critical review to the  
23 terminal that handles the LNG, and even less critical review  
24 to the electrical plant, and virtually no critical review to  
25 the associated bulk cargo terminal.

**PM3**

**Continued, page 167 of 187**

PM3-127

The state is responsible for permitting the electrical plant. In regard to the LNG facility, please see the analysis and the list of information requests in section 4.13.

PM3-127

W-1819



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

168

1 I don't agree with FERC's findings in the draft  
2 EIS that the inclusion of a second berth for a large  
3 commercial vessel would not substantially change the  
4 environmental impacts of the project. There would be a lot  
5 of dredging associated with that second berth that will have  
6 wetland impacts and could be avoided.

7 The EIS only considers the impacts of the berth;  
8 it doesn't consider the impacts of the shore-side  
9 development that would be associated with serving that  
10 non-LNG berth at the terminal.

11 If a general cargo terminal is to be developed in  
12 this port, the need and the purpose of the terminal should  
13 be fully justified and evaluated on its own merits.

14 Similarly, I request that the final EIS include a  
15 more thorough evaluation of alternatives to supplying power  
16 to the LNG terminal. It's possible to do an LNG terminal  
17 where the LNG could be chilled just using grid-based power.

18 Previous projects in our area considered  
19 energy-intensive activities, like a steel processing  
20 facility. And they looked at alternatives that included  
21 bringing new transmission lines in from the grid.

22 So I ask that the final EIS consider a more  
23 thorough rather than a narrative analysis of alternatives  
24 for the sources of energy to be supplied to the plant.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

PM3-128

PM3-129

**PM3**

**Continued, page 168 of 187**

PM3-128 The multi-user slip has been dropped from the proposed project. The Coast Guard has determined the full 800-foot slip would be needed for the safe use of the terminal by LNG tankers.

PM3-129 Jordan Cove would obtain water from the Coos Bay North Bend Water Board. The board has stated that they would be able to supply the amount needed. See section 4.4.21.1.

W-1820

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

169

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is John.  
3 MR. NEIKIRK: John Neikirk, J-o-h-n  
4 K-e-i-k-i-r-k. I'm a resident of Coos County for over 35  
5 years.  
6 And I present to you a page from the FEIS  
7 previously published by FERC from page 4-7 -- 4.7-3. Excuse  
8 me.  
9 This is showing the tanker hazard zone as mapped  
10 by FERC. However, in the current FERC DEIS they have  
11 elected not to post this; only reference to it. However, it  
12 does appear that it came from a high school biology class  
13 about what is happening here to the bay.  
14 We have an injection of desecration. Zone one,  
15 marked in yellow, says 'No one is expected to survive in  
16 this zone. Structures will self-ignite just from the heat.'  
17 Zone two, marked in green, 'People will be at  
18 risk of receiving second-degree burns within thirty seconds  
19 on exposure to skin in this zone.'  
20 Zone three, the blue, is 'People are still at  
21 risk of burns if they don't seek shelter. But exposure time  
22 is longer than in zone two.'  
23 They don't say how long it will take.  
24 We are not supposed to be afraid of this. You  
25 can see the populous area, the schools that are involved.

PM3-130

**PM3**

**Continued, page 169 of 187**

PM3-130 FERC provided this map in the 2009 FEIS, incorporated by reference into this EIS (see section 1.1.1 of the DEIS). Section 4.13.2 of the DEIS includes extensive information on terminal safety and risks. As stated in that section, with the exception of a 1944 incident in Cleveland, the LNG industry in the US has been free of safety-related incidents adversely impacting the public or the environment. The most serious incident world-wide, an accident in Algeria in 2004 killed 27 workers and injured 56 workers at the terminal, but no members of the public were injured. See section 4.4.13.6 for a discussion of hazards associated with transporting LNG. As the incident history detailed in the section shows, LNG tanker incidents are uncommon and those that have occurred have not resulted in harm to the public (see section 4.13.6.1).

W-1821

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

170

PM3

Continued, page 170 of 187

1 I submit that you reinstate this into the current  
2 DEIS. You have this information.  
3 Secondly, Coos County has received over \$2.5  
4 million from Jordan Cove as a chum to be able to use Coos  
5 County's pipeline. Coos County is receiving \$25,000 a month  
6 plus a \$200,000 payment when they sign the agreement. They  
7 should also be paying Coos County another \$200,000 because  
8 they have already started construction on the north spit.  
9 There was a time when they have driven piling,  
10 built roads, done clearing, built a sediment pond. And have  
11 at this time a forty foot drill platform sitting out there  
12 on location, not where it shows within any renderings or  
13 drawings, but close to the Roseburg property.  
14 Thank you.  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
16 (Applause.)  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Fred Messerle.  
18 And after Fred is -- After Fred I'd like Ray  
19 Ford, Bittan Duggan, and Fred Williams -- Frank Williams.  
20 Fred.  
21 MR. MESSERLE: Thank you. I appreciate the  
22 opportunity to come this evening and visit with you about  
23 our concerns.  
24 My name is Fred Messerle, F-r-e-d  
25 M-e-s-s-e-r-l-e. I represent Messerle & Sons, which I'm a

PM3-130  
Cont'd

PM3-131

PM3-131

Comment noted.

W-1822

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

171

1 part owner and general manager.

2 We're going to be impacted. I want to speak to  
3 the area between mile post 11.1 and 21.8. That's the Coos  
4 River to Sumner stretch and the Blue Ridge alternative  
5 route.

6 We're going to experience -- either way it will  
7 go through our properties and will be about -- we're about  
8 15 percent of the distance on either route.

9 Our concern -- my concern this evening is the  
10 process. I think the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
11 -- basically the conclusions on the Blue Ridge route, they  
12 cherry-pick data to fit a pre-ordained conclusion.

13 I think that we can better address those in  
14 writing.

15 But I do ask the question, on the 4th of October  
16 in 2013, the FERC staff recommended the Blue Ridge route,  
17 asked Pacific Connector to provide information, which they  
18 did. Basically it was all supportive of the Blue Ridge  
19 route. And what we find in the draft EIS is is that there's  
20 no objective criteria for evaluating the data on either the  
21 proposed route and comparing it to the Blue Ridge route.

22 In addition, the National Marine Fisheries  
23 Service, which is a big part of the evaluation of this --  
24 particularly with the 66 water bodies or 65 water bodies on  
25 the proposed route and only eight on the Blue Ridge route --

PM3-132

PM3-133

## PM3

## Continued, page 171 of 187

PM3-132 The cooperating agencies have examined the Blue Ridge alternative based on public comments received. The FEIS contains a new appendix that contains additional details regarding the comparison of the proposed route to the Blue Ridge alternative.

PM3-133 The NMFS is not a cooperating agency on this project and they chose not to provide comments on the DEIS. They will issue their biological opinion several months after the FEIS.

W-1823

172

PM3

Continued, page 172 of 187

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 they haven't even -- as of last week they haven't even  
2 started their evaluation process. So how can you properly  
3 evaluate these alternatives if you haven't even went through  
4 the process?

PM3-133  
Cont'd

5 In conclusion, what this really appears to be now  
6 is a question of feathers versus fins and people. And we're  
7 not quite clear yet how the process plays out for you to  
8 come to a reasonable and logical conclusion.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is -- I think it's Ray Ford.

13 (No response.)

14 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Try Frank Williams. He'll

15 talk.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: How about Bittan Dugan?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

19 (No response.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Frank Williams it is.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm Frank Williams. I'm a retired

22 longshoreman. Lived here probably -- almost 55 years.

23 I like to listen to everything and then -- and go

24 after some of the people that talked before me so I can kind

25 of analyze things.

W-1824

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 173

1 I see the one doctor, and he was right. There  
2 was mills that had emissions -- about ten of them in Coos  
3 Bay, North Bend close, right in this area. Two of them was  
4 pulp mills. So that pretty much, if the weigh the emissions  
5 from what we're going to be putting out there and what's  
6 lost.

7 Plus there's been over -- between 2000 and 2500  
8 in mills in the four northwest states close. Maybe you  
9 remember the old burners they had out there. That's all  
10 gone. There's some emissions gone.

11 So when we start talking about emissions, we've  
12 cleaned there up quite a bit. How far can we go? And this  
13 isn't steel. Does that mean jobs -- is that a new way of  
14 saying jobs or no jobs, you know.

15 I didn't have no paperwork from the Sierra Club,  
16 but I wrote this on my hand. They said -- trying to handle  
17 the emissions. Now these oysters, they can be picked up and  
18 transferred. And this is county-leased land.

19 I remember when I was long-shoring that a load of  
20 oysters come in here on a ship and they was watering them  
21 down all the time from Japan. Oysters can be moved.

22 Dan right here in this area moved a clam bed.  
23 Them things can be moved.

24 As far as I can remember, I fished and hunted and  
25 did crabbing here. It's been good all these years. And

W-1825

PM3

Continued, page 174 of 187

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

174

1 when we had shipping, it seemed to be better when we had  
2 more ships. We had 384 ships a year. Back down to about  
3 sixty now.

4 I guess you can see I am in favor of the  
5 pipeline. But I still understand where these folks are  
6 coming, these land-owners. I understand where they're  
7 coming from. It's something that they need to talk about  
8 and maybe ask for a little bit more money. I don't know.

9 I had a guy come out to the hay barn the other  
10 day. And I said, 'What do you do for them?' 'I'm a  
11 surveyor.' 'Well, who you been working for?' 'Well, I've  
12 been surveying for the pipeline.' He says, 'We don't do all  
13 these instruments; we do it by GPS.' He said, 'We dang near  
14 got killed on that job.' 'What happened?' He says, 'Farmer  
15 got irate; come out there and about run over with a  
16 tractor.' He didn't want -- 'Get off my land,' he says.

17 And two days later he come back and he says --  
18 and they told him. He says, 'You know you have two more  
19 pipelines on this property?' No, I don't. And he couldn't  
20 find them. They pointed them out. Two days later they let  
21 him go in and do the surveying.

22 So as far as the quake, I'm not worried about no  
23 earthquake. I mean we can live on fear all your life and  
24 fear things.

25 And the studies, the doing studies: I've done

W-1826

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 studies myself. Anybody can do studies. I studied it  
2 because -- I studied these guard rails. Why'd they put the  
3 guard rails in? Because the chuck holes: It keeps you from  
4 going off the road, you know.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: I know, Frank, you want to --

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, let me say one more thing.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: In Boston -- I'm about the last  
9 one, I know. In Boston I did a show with a guy that's been  
10 there for forty years. I know it's been up there in Alaska  
11 for years. It's not as volatile as what the people are  
12 trying to say, some of these things.

13 And I think you guys need to quit kicking the can  
14 down the road.

15 And last January the CEO from Jordan Cove come  
16 down --

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I know you want to wrap up  
18 right now.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: \$43 million has been spent on --

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much for your  
21 comments, Frank.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.

24 Steve Hold, Stacey McLaughlin, Cindy Haws, Ted  
25 Gleichman, and Teresa Rigg.

W-1827



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 176

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Then I guess we have no  
2 choice. So when I call your name speak from up there really  
3 loudly.  
4 So now I've got Steve --  
5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: The court reporter -- or  
6 the reporter up here just wanted to make sure that you know  
7 that you will not be on the record if you do not speak --  
8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah. You know what? We have  
9 these traveling mikes.  
10 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Will that  
11 work?  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Will that work?  
13 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: She'd have to speak into  
14 the mike. We don't have anything else down there to record.  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah. I'll bring the Mike up to  
16 her.  
17 All right. So do we have Steve Hold?  
18 (No response.)  
19 MR. FRIEDMAN: I think the answer is no.  
20 Do we have Stacey?  
21 MS. MC LAUGHLIN: You do.  
22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good.  
23 MS. MC LAUGHLIN: My name is Stacey McLaughlin,  
24 S-t-a-c-e-y M-c-L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n.  
25 I am an affected property owner. I am also a

W-1828

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

177

1 government official for the last thirty years who's spent a  
2 lot of my time reviewing DEISs and EISs and FEISs. And I  
3 can tell you without a doubt that this is one of the most  
4 disappointing documents I've ever seen. Not simply because  
5 I'm affected by it personally, but because it has something  
6 to do with an entire community -- not just Coos County,  
7 Douglas County, Klamath County, Josephine County. And it's  
8 dividing these communities because it is not a comprehensive  
9 nor a logical document. It is simply a written shell game.  
10 It is confusing and it is incomplete. The  
11 alternatives that are offered by Jordan Cove and Pacific  
12 Connector pipeline in this document are inadequate and  
13 insufficient for FERC to be able to even come anywhere close  
14 to issuing a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity  
15 to allow for any export of liquefied natural gas from this  
16 country or to justify any eminent domain proceedings.  
17 Eminent domain and the safety of the rural  
18 communities is not adequately addressed.  
19 The 36 inch diameter super high pressure gas  
20 pipeline, carrying dangerous un-odorized gas for over 230  
21 miles across southern Oregon will pass through over 300  
22 private lands, not to mention the public lands, to get this  
23 gas to Asia. Ninety percent of the land-owners, as I  
24 understand it, have said no.  
25 My property is not addressed in this DEIS because

PM3-134

PM3-135

**PM3**

**Continued, page 177 of 187**

- PM3-134 The EIS analyzes the proposed project in the application submitted to FERC. It discusses other options for meeting the project's objectives in chapter 3. In this case, we determined that the Oregon LNG Project may be an alternative to the Jordan Cove Project. We are considering that project is a separate EIS. The Commission may decide to approve one or both of these projects. If both are approved, the market will decide which is built, or if neither is built. FERC does not pick winners and losers; it lets the market decide.
- PM3-135 The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. Safety of rural communities is addressed in section 4.13 of the DEIS.

W-1829

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

178

1 I've refused to allow anyone access.

2 And, for the record, how dare anyone think that  
3 my 40-plus years of hard work to purchase my property and  
4 live my dream is anywhere less important to a job that  
5 someone else wants.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MC LAUGHLIN: FERC has already decided to let  
8 Verison save money as it is examined in this DEIS by cutting  
9 safety precautions through most of this area. There are  
10 less than ten families living along one mile of a proposed  
11 pipeline route.

12 The rural areas are called class one, where  
13 Williams can use thinner pipes, less welds, less  
14 inspections, and a host of other cost-saving measures. If  
15 the pipeline leaks or blows up, it would only kill a few of  
16 us instead of thousands in an urban area where safety  
17 precautions are required.

18 Please do not believe for one minute that safety  
19 is any less important to those of us who live in rural areas  
20 than it is in an urban area. And just once let's let this  
21 be about the planet.

22 From my perspective, this project has not been  
23 adequately examined in order to receive any kind of  
24 permissions or approvals.

25 Thank you.

**PM3**

**Continued, page 178 of 187**

PM3-136

Pipe thickness and other pipeline safety standards are discussed in section 4.13.9.1 of the DEIS. These standards are set by the DOT, not by the FERC.

PM3-136

W-1830

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

179

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
2 (Applause.)  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Cindy Haws.  
4 MS. HAWS: Cindy Haws, C-i-n-d-y H-a-w-s.  
5 I would like to add that the LNG and the  
6 pipeline, I ask FERC not to issue this permit and determine  
7 this project is not a public convenience and necessity.  
8 There will be perhaps temporary jobs in this  
9 project based on this proposal. But then let's consider  
10 when those temporary jobs are gone. Who and what is left  
11 afterwards.  
12 Taking food and sustainable jobs away from the  
13 rest of us rural people, thousands of us out there, myself  
14 also spending my entire life in order to be able to raise my  
15 own food. And this project will adversely affect the water  
16 and the climate.  
17 In particular for me in terms of the local  
18 impacts of the water, that includes the fact that you have  
19 not -- your engineering designs are unproven in your  
20 mitigation. Therefore it still is adverse impacts. It's  
21 simply just a bunch of techno-engineering designs.  
22 We will still have the impacts to our salmon and  
23 to our clean water. That means that my job and the food  
24 that I put on the table will be very much restricted, if at  
25 all.

PM3-137

PM3-138

PM3-139

**PM3**

**Continued, page 179 of 187**

PM3-137 Impacts to water are addressed in section 4.4. Impacts to climate are addressed in sections 4.12 and 4.14.  
PM3-138 Comment noted.  
PM3-139 Comment noted.

W-1831

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

180

1 And that gets to the next topic of climate,  
2 because we're talking about climate change and we're talking  
3 about the impacts of the LNG. It's a highly processed  
4 fossil fuel that contributes to climate change.

5 There's been a number of publications and an  
6 Oregonian article talking about the LNG project. The Jordan  
7 Cove LNG project could be a big greenhouse gas emitter. And  
8 that is proven by a number of things, especially the fact  
9 that cumulative effects of the fracking, which is a highly  
10 polluting practice taking away water from other people,  
11 which I call blood gas -- blood gas for those of you who  
12 want to work to support that. It's blood gas for all of us.

13 So taking away our -- the polluting practice of  
14 fracking, which increases not only -- it puts up to nine  
15 percent of the methane drilled by fracking escapes into the  
16 atmosphere. The process of fracking, liquefying, shipping,  
17 and other methane leaks along the way, increases the  
18 contribution to climate change even more since methane is 86  
19 times more potent a greenhouse gas.

20 Therefore, the cumulative effects need to address  
21 the inter-relatedness of the fracking that supplies the gas  
22 that then gets converted into this liquid natural gas and  
23 exported.

24 And also, by the way, China has 1.7 times the  
25 amount of gas in their shale as we do.

PM3-140

**PM3**

**Continued, page 180 of 187**

PM3-140

Impacts from the proposed project have been quantified in the EIS. Fracking is not addressed because it is one of several possible means of obtaining natural gas upstream of the pipeline, and is occurring whether this pipeline is built or not. FERC does not regulate the exploration of natural gas, which fracking is a part of.

W-1832

181

PM3

Continued, page 181 of 187

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1           And so it will cause loss of over a million  
2   manufacturing jobs because we're going to be exporting those  
3   manufacturing jobs with our natural gas.  
4           MR. FRIEDMAN: And, Cindy, I know you want to  
5   wrap it up right now.  
6           MS. MC LAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.  
7           (Applause.)  
8           ;MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
9           Is Ted Gleichman here?  
10          MR. GLEICHMAN: Yes.  
11          Shall I set my own timer?  
12          I'm Ted Gleichman. I do have paperwork from the  
13   Sierra Club because I represent Sierra Club.  
14          That's Ted -- T-e-d G-l-e-i-c-h-m-a-n.  
15          And we strongly concur with the folks here who  
16   believe that it is Coos County's turn. However, we see many  
17   deficiencies in the EIS. We will be commenting on those  
18   specifically over time.  
19          And I have the privilege and opportunity to be  
20   with you for the rest of the week. And I want to speak  
21   tonight specifically about the jobs issue.  
22          We have no doubt that this project could be  
23   completed properly and effectively as planned. There is  
24   excellent technology and very strong skill sets provided by  
25   the people who are in this room still, who have been in this

W-1833

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

182

1 room, and who are not in this room but are involved in  
2 working this project.

3 But this is not the project that we need. The  
4 project that's needed for the coast and for inland is two  
5 sets of good jobs. Good jobs that play to fossil fuels are  
6 a fallacy at this point in the history of the climate  
7 degradation that we are already experiencing. And the EIS  
8 does not properly address this.

9 The jobs that contribute to further destabilizing  
10 the climate -- again, not good jobs. The long-term,  
11 permanent and sustainable jobs we need desperately on the  
12 Oregon coast and inland are two major types.

13 First, we need massive infrastructure and  
14 building protection programs against the coming earthquake  
15 and tsunami. This includes refuge centers, relocation or  
16 reconstruction of hospitals, schools, police and fire  
17 stations, water and food suppliers, and other vital  
18 services.

19 Transportation links must be rebuilt. Oregon 42  
20 is going to be down in a dozen different places when the big  
21 one does hit. And it will. Residences, commercial  
22 buildings, other facilities must be protected or relocated.

23 Second, we need clean local renewable energy with  
24 a decentralized electrical grid. Doing this for the coast  
25 and inland, converting off fossil fuels is also vital for

PM3-141

PM3-142

PM3-143

PM3-144

## PM3

## Continued, page 182 of 187

PM3-141 Comment noted.

PM3-142 Massive infrastructure and building protection programs, other than for project facilities, are beyond the scope of this EIS, which is evaluating an LNG terminal and associated gas pipeline.

PM3-143 Replacing Highway 42 is beyond the scope of this analysis. FERC does not regulate highways.

PM3-144 Comment noted.

W-1834

183

PM3

Continued, page 183 of 187

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 resilience against the earthquake. And the technologies for  
2 clean, sustainable, renewable energy are here, present,  
3 ready to go, and create good jobs.

PM3-144  
Cont'd

4 Thank you very much.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

7 Steve's going to bring the microphone back to

8 Theresa.

9 MS. RIGG: Ok.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Theresa, if you could wait for the  
11 microphone.

12 MS. RIGG: I'm coming. I can be loud.

13 I can't keep my hands -- will you hold it?

14 Okay. My name's Theresa Rigg. I live in the

15 very north end of Coos Bay, kind of a splinter sticking into

16 North Bend. I have lived on that hill almost my entire

17 life. I've been here sixty -- well, since 1951. And I'll

18 get back to that in a minute because there's some relevance

19 there.

20 But I am concerned about the pollution. I'm not

21 going to read from the document. I had meant to bring

22 copies from the Coos Bay World's two articles that covered

23 it this week. But due to some handy helpers and a flying

24 Siamese cat, I no longer have the copies. Don't ask.

25 However, in the article it was stated that the

W-1835



20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

184

1 pollution levels would be higher than any previous industry  
2 in the area and that it would record higher than the  
3 Boardman coal plant, which has been a thorn for decades and  
4 supposedly a real polluter. Everyone that I know that I  
5 grew up with on that hill -- we lived on McPherson in 1951  
6 and on Skyline, I grew up almost -- over half my life on  
7 that hill.  
8 Everyone I know that I went to school with or  
9 lived with in that neighborhood has at the very minimum  
10 asthma and some respiratory distress. At a maximum, we have  
11 chemical allergies, food allergies. I have all of the  
12 above.  
13 To bring in something which would surpass that  
14 level of pollution is very worrying to me. I don't want to  
15 see another generation grow up with the illnesses and things  
16 that we have had.  
17 I am now considered disabled, which is another  
18 thing I'm worried about when I hear how much things are  
19 going to go up. I wonder actually if there's going to be  
20 any margin for people here on a fixed income. But that's  
21 just my own personal aside. So let me get back to the  
22 subject.  
23 Having been here that long, I don't want to hear  
24 any more that old people don't care about the kids, have  
25 forgotten what it's like, or have no idea what's going on.

PM3-145

**PM3**

**Continued, page 184 of 187**

PM3-145

Climate change was addressed in section 4.14.3.12 of the DEIS. Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project were discussed in section 4.12.1.4 of the DEIS. See response to IND1-1.

W-1836

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

185

1 We grew up the same way. I grew up hungry. I care about  
2 kids: I taught school, I worked in group homes.  
3 Ever since I came here I've seen Evans Products,  
4 JP, Weyerhaeuser, the nickel plant, the Australian sand  
5 silicon plant, and many other companies come in here. Make  
6 problems; we'll give them all the breaks. Build this big  
7 plant. Say, okay, now you get the jobs. They've told us  
8 how to live, what we can do, and then pulled out and left us  
9 with a mess to clean up.  
10 I don't want to see that happen again. I think  
11 that in order to have sustainable jobs in Coos Bay we've got  
12 to support local businesses.  
13 And I think that we need to be sure that what we  
14 do do we do right. The stakes are rising. The money has  
15 gone astronomically. The risk is exponentially growing with  
16 that promised reward.  
17 So whatever you do, please make sure that it's  
18 done right.  
19 Thank you.  
20 (Applause.)  
21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I only have one more person on the  
22 list. Craig Sprout.  
23 MR. SPJUT: Well, good evening. My name is Craig  
24 Spjut. That's C-r-a-i-g S-p-j-u-t. And I am the South  
25 Coast Assistant Training Coordinator for UA Local 290.

W-1837

186

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

PM3

Continued, page 186 of 187

1 I used to live in the Umpqua trailer park resort,  
2 and I worked at IP Gardner Mill about 35 years ago. Since  
3 then I've lived in various parts throughout Oregon, like  
4 Clatskanie, Buena, up in that area, and then off towards The  
5 Dalles, and as far East in Oregon as Boardman. And I worked  
6 at the coal-fired powerhouse there. And I know a little bit  
7 about different facilities.

8 But what I want to talk about is, like somebody  
9 spoke earlier about thinking globally and acting locally.  
10 And also I want to talk about our young people today and how  
11 they need jobs.

12 And I think an apprenticeship's a good thing to  
13 go -- that way to go. It's a good entry level position  
14 pay-wise, and then it's also you can grow in the trade and  
15 you can raise a family and support yourself.

16 I also -- I want to thank FERC for sending me the  
17 CD. I did receive the draft environmental report. And I  
18 did look through it. It was 5000-plus pages. I reviewed --  
19 and I agreed with most of what I reviewed. I thought it was  
20 well done.

21 And the proposal, the project I think is in an  
22 excellent location. I think it will actually help the  
23 environment, where it is, compared to the other alternative  
24 sites that have been proposed. I believe the geologists and  
25 the engineers that have worked to supply accurate data that

W-1838

20150113-4002 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

187

1 has been provided in the document for the project.

2 I want to thank the panel for all the hard work  
3 that they're doing. And I want to thank you for the  
4 opportunity to speak.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Craig was the last person I had on  
9 my list. So we are actually going to come to a conclusion  
10 here.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: I want to thank all of you for  
13 hanging in there. The room was much more crowded at 6:00  
14 p.m. than it is now. And so you guys are true public  
15 meeting warriors. And I appreciate you staying to the end.

16 On behalf of the FERC and our federal cooperating  
17 agency partners, I'd like to thank you for coming tonight  
18 and providing us with your comments on our DEIS for the  
19 Jordan Cove Pacific Connector project.

20 Let the record show that this meeting concluded  
21 at 10:30 p.m.

22 (Whereupon, at 10:30 p.m., the Jordan Cove  
23 Pacific Connector Scoping meeting was adjourned.)

24

25

W-1839

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1

PM4

Public Meeting, Umpqua Community College, December 9,  
2014

PM4

1                               BEFORE THE  
2                               FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
3   ----- x  
4   IN THE MATTER OF:                               : Project No.  
5   JORDAN COVE - PACIFIC CONNECTOR               : CP13-483-000  
6   PIPELINE PROJECT                               : CP13-492-000  
7   ----- x  
8  
9                               Umpqua Community College  
10                               1988 Newmark Ave.  
11                               Roseburg, OR 97470  
12  
13                               Tuesday, December 9, 2014  
14                               The above-entitled matter came on for technical  
15   conference, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Paul Friedman,  
16   the moderator.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

2

PM4

Continued, page 2 of 162

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (6:00 p.m.)

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: On behalf of the Federal Energy  
4 Regulatory Commission, which we abbreviate as F-E-R-C, or  
5 the Commission, one of the things that someone commented  
6 yesterday -- all right. In order for us to run the meeting,  
7 it would be nice if everyone was a little more quiet. I  
8 appreciate that.

9 One of the instant comments we got yesterday in  
10 beautiful Coos Bay was that our DEIS was filled with  
11 acronyms and abbreviations. And it's true. And so tonight,  
12 unfortunately, I'm going to use some more abbreviations and  
13 acronyms, but I'll try and say it, you know, once and then  
14 use the acronym repeatedly so you kind of get used to it.

15 So the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is  
16 the FERC or the Commission. And I'm speaking now and you'll  
17 have your turn later.

18 My American is Paul Friedman and I am the project  
19 manager for the Jordan Cove Pacific Connector Project for  
20 FERC. It's my job to manage the production of the  
21 environmental impact statement. And we issued a draft  
22 environmental impact statement -- FERC did, along with our  
23 federal cooperating agency partners on November 7th, 2014.  
24 The purpose of this meeting is to take comments from the  
25 public about the draft environmental impact statement and

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

3

PM4

Continued, page 3 of 162

1 hopefully those comments will be focused on the  
2 environmental issues that are contained in that document.

3           Also here with me tonight from FERC is Steve  
4 Busch. He's the assistant FERC project manager. Next to  
5 Steve is Miriam Liberatore. She's from the Bureau of Land  
6 Management. And she's the BLM's project manager. And next  
7 to her, Mark Mackiewicz who is a national project manager  
8 for the BLM. He's stationed in Utah, but he does work all  
9 across the country. And if any of you remember the Ruby  
10 project, he ran that project.

11           Next to Mark is Wes Yamamoto with the U.S. Forest  
12 Service. And Wes is the Forest Service's project manager  
13 and we're all partners together in this. And at the back of  
14 the room I have John Scott and John Crookston who work for a  
15 company called Tetra Tech and they are my third-party  
16 environmental contractors and they helped in the production  
17 of the DEIS.

18           Also we have Paul Uncapher from North States  
19 Resources and Paul and his company are third-party  
20 contractors for the Forest Service and the BLM. And, again,  
21 they wrote portions of the DEIS.

22           Let the record show that this meeting began at  
23 approximately 6 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9th, 2014 here at  
24 Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon. And I would  
25 like to thank the Community College for setting up this room

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

4

PM4

Continued, page 4 of 162

1 and doing the audio for us and helping us with this meeting.

2 And we greatly appreciate that.

3 As you can see this meeting is being recorded.

4 In the back I have a court reporter and that is so there

5 will be accurate notes in the public record of what we say

6 tonight. And the court reporter is an employee of Ace

7 Federal Reporters, Inc. They're an independent contractor

8 and Ace will sell you copies of the transcripts of this

9 meeting at various sliding scale prices beginning from same

10 day to five business days after this meeting. And

11 eventually Ace will give the FERC a copy of the transcripts

12 and at that point we'll put it into our public file through

13 our e-library system and I'll talk about e-library a little

14 bit later on.

15 If you want to be a speaker tonight, this is your

16 opportunity to go to the back of the room, see the two Johns

17 from Tetra Tech and sign our speakers list. I will call

18 people up later in this meeting according to the order in

19 which they signed up, but everyone will get the same amount

20 of time, about three minutes, and we'll stay here until they

21 kick us out or we're all done with the speakers' list.

22 The production of the draft environmental impact

23 statement was a cooperative effort involving a number of

24 federal cooperating agencies including FERC, the BLM, the

25 Forest Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

5

PM4

Continued, page 5 of 162

1 Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection  
2 Agency, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Coast  
3 Guard, the U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife  
4 Service, and Bureau of Reclamation and the Pipeline and  
5 Hazardous Material Safety Administration of the U.S.  
6 Department of Transportation.

7 The cooperating agencies had an opportunity to  
8 review an administrative draft of the EIS and some agencies  
9 actually contributed lot of text to the document. For  
10 example, the BLM and the Forest Service and their  
11 third-party contractor wrote sections of the EIS related to  
12 their evaluation of opposed amendments to their individual  
13 district or national forest, land management plans, to make  
14 provision for the pipeline.

15 In a few minutes a BLM representative, also  
16 representing the Forest Service, will explain what those  
17 agencies' obligations are in regard to this project. And I  
18 would like to thank the federal cooperating agencies'  
19 partners for their participation in our environmental review  
20 process.

21 The FERC is an independent federal agency that  
22 regulates, among other things, the interstate transportation  
23 of natural gas. We were originally called the Federal Power  
24 Commission when we were created in 1920 and our name and  
25 mission was changed under the Carter administration.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

6

PM4

Continued, page 6 of 162

1           The Five Commissioners who are at the head of our  
2 Commission are appointed by the President of the United  
3 States and approved by Congress. Steve and I are not  
4 appointed by the president. We are mere civil servants. We  
5 call ourselves staff and the Commissioners who sit at the  
6 head of our Commission take staff recommendations into  
7 consideration before they make decisions. In this case you  
8 can actually find our recommendations relating to the  
9 environmental impacts of this project in Chapter 5.2 of the  
10 DEIS.

11           In accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005,  
12 and the Natural Gas Act, the FERC is the lead federal agency  
13 responsible for authorizing on-shore liquefied natural gas,  
14 we're going to abbreviate that as LNG, and terminals onshore  
15 and interstate natural gas transmission facilities. We're  
16 also the lead agency for compliance with the National  
17 Environmental Policy Act of 1969 which we abbreviate as  
18 NEPA.

19           Our DEIS was prepared to satisfy the Council on  
20 Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the  
21 NEPA. The federal cooperating agencies can adopt our EIS  
22 for the regulatory needs and to comply with the NEPA.  
23 However, each independent agency would present their own  
24 conclusions in their respective records of decision. The  
25 FERC's record of decision is called a commission order and

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

7

PM4

Continued, page 7 of 162

1 it has not been produced yet. The FERC has not made a  
2 decision about this project and I'll reiterate that later on  
3 in my speech.

4 On May 21st, 2013, Jordon Cove Energy Project LP,  
5 which we just call Jordon Cove, filed an application with  
6 the FERC under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act in Docket  
7 No. CP13-483000 seeking authority to construct and operate  
8 an LNG export terminal at Coos Bay in Coos County Oregon.  
9 Jordon Cove intends to produce about six million metric tons  
10 per year of LNG, a supply of about one billion cubic feet  
11 per day of natural gas for shipment by third-party vessels  
12 to customers around the Pacific Rim. Jordon Cove already  
13 has permission from the Department of Energy to export to  
14 both free trade agreement nations and non-free trade  
15 agreement nations.

16 The main facilities that are proposed as part of  
17 the Jordon Cove complex include a 422 megawatt power plan, a  
18 natural gas processing plant, four liquefaction trains, two  
19 LNG storage tanks, a transfer pipeline, a loading platform,  
20 a marine slip with docks for LNG vessels and tugboats and an  
21 access channel connecting to the existing Coos Bay  
22 navigation channel.

23 Pacific Connector gas pipeline LP, which I will  
24 abbreviate as Pacific Connector filed its application with  
25 the FERC in docket number CP13-492-000 under Section 7 of

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

8

PM4

Continued, page 8 of 162

1 the Natural Gas Act on June 6, 2013.  
2 Pacific Connector seeks authority to construct  
3 and operate a 232-mile long, 36-inch diameter, underground,  
4 welded-steel transmission pipeline between the Malin hub and  
5 the Jordon Cove terminal at Coos Bay.  
6 The pipeline route would cross portions of  
7 Klamath, Jackson, Douglas, and Coos Counties, Oregon, near  
8 Malin Pacific Connector would connect with existing pipeline  
9 facilities of gas transmission of Gas Transmission  
10 Northwest, which I will abbreviate as GTN, and Ruby  
11 Pipeline, LLC, which I'll abbreviate as Ruby, to obtain  
12 natural gas produced in western Canada and the Rocky  
13 Mountains.  
14 For full disclosure it turns out that one of the  
15 partners in the Pacific Connector, Jordon Cove Project is  
16 now a co-owner of Ruby. GTN is owned by a company called  
17 TransCanada.  
18 The Pacific Connector Pipeline would have a  
19 design capacity of about 1.07 billion cubic feet per day  
20 with 0.04 BCF a day dedicated delivery for the existing  
21 Northwest Pipeline Grand Pass Lateral to serve customers in  
22 Oregon. Again, for full disclosure, it turns out that the  
23 Northwest Pipeline is owned by one of the partners in  
24 Pacific Connector.  
25 (Laughter.)

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

9

PM4

Continued, page 9 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Other facilities associated with  
2 the Pacific Connector project -- and, by the way, all that  
3 information is in the EIS. It's public knowledge. Other  
4 facilities associated with the Pacific Connector project  
5 include a four -- a 41,000 horsepower compressor station  
6 near Malin, two receipt meter stations for GTN and Ruby  
7 within the compressor station tract, the Clarks Branch  
8 delivery meter station at the interconnection with  
9 Northwest, a delivery meter station at the interconnection  
10 with Jordan Cove, five pig launchers and receivers, 17  
11 mainland valves and 11 communication towers.

12 Jordan Cove would receive its supply of natural  
13 gas from Pacific Connector, therefore the FERC considers the  
14 two separate applications to be connected actions and we  
15 evaluated both of their environmental impacts together in  
16 our DEIS.

17 The two companies also share some ownership  
18 overlap which again is disclosed in the DEIS.

19 I want to make it very clear that the project is  
20 being proposed by two private companies, Jordan Cove and  
21 Pacific Connector. The companies came up with the design  
22 for their facilities and their locations and it's the FERC's  
23 job to analyze the environmental impacts associated with the  
24 construction and operation of those facilities. The FERC is  
25 not an advocate for the project. We don't care whether it's

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

10

PM4

Continued, page 10 of 162

1 built or not. We are advocates for the environmental review  
2 process.

3 The Commissioners will make their own independent  
4 decision whether or not this project has benefits and would  
5 be in the public interest. Again, that decision has not  
6 been made and will not be made until after we issue a final  
7 environmental impact statement.

8 During our review of the project, we assembled  
9 information from a variety of sources including the  
10 applications and data responses of Jordan Cove and Pacific  
11 Connector public input data provided by other federal,  
12 state, and local resource agencies and our own research.  
13 Our analysis can be found in the DEIS.

14 We sent copies of our DEIS out to our  
15 environmental mailing list which included elected officials,  
16 federal, state, and local agencies, regional environmental  
17 groups, and nongovernmental agencies, affected landowners,  
18 Indian tribes, commenters, and other interested parties,  
19 local newspapers and libraries, and parties to the  
20 proceeding. Paper copies were only sent to those who  
21 requested them in response to our notice of intent or our  
22 NOI. All others received a compact disc or CD version of  
23 the DEIS.

24 We have no more hard copies. We only printed  
25 enough to go out to those who requested them earlier.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

11

PM4

Continued, page 11 of 162

1 Everyone who received a copy of the DEIS will also be sent a  
2 copy of the final EIS. You do not have to sign up again.  
3 However, if you did not receive a copy of the DEIS and you  
4 want to get a copy of the FEIS, all you have to do is go  
5 back and see the two Johns from Tetrattech at the back of the  
6 room and we have an environmental mailing list back there  
7 that you can sign up on.

8 Also, if you want a hard copy of the FEIS, you  
9 request if from the Johns. About 72 miles of the pipeline  
10 route would cross federal lands including 40 miles of BLM  
11 land, 31 miles of Forest Service Land and less than a mile  
12 of reclamation land.

13 At this point I'd like to introduce Miriam  
14 Liberatore, representing the BLM and the Forest Service and  
15 she'll explain what those agencies are doing in regards to  
16 this project.

17 Miriam, would you come up now?

18 MS. LIBERATORE: How's that sound, is that loud  
19 enough? Okay. Thanks

20 Thank you, Paul. And thank you all of you for  
21 coming out tonight. We're happy to see you here and we want  
22 to hear what you have to say.

23 My name again is Miriam Liberatore and I'm with  
24 the Medford --

25 (Chorus of louder.)

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

12

PM4

Continued, page 12 of 162

1 MS. LIBERATORE: Louder? I can do that. How's

2 that?

3 Got it?

4 I'm Miriam Liberatore and I'm with the Medford

5 District BLM and I'm the project manager for the BLM for

6 this project.

7 So the BLM and the Forest Service are involved in

8 this project where the project is proposed to cross federal

9 lands. And the federal lands we're talking about are those

10 managed by the BLM, the Forest Service, and reclamation.

11 And as Paul said, most of the land is with the BLM, it's 40

12 miles or so out of the 70, 30 of it is the Forest Service

13 administered land and reclamation has facilities on a little

14 less than a mile of the lands that are crossing.

15 We have no involvement whatsoever with the

16 facility at Coos Bay, and we have no involvement with any of

17 the pipeline crossing private land.

18 We have decisions to make with this project and

19 those are two of them for the BLM, well, two for both. We

20 have to make decisions on the right-of-way grant that we've

21 received an application for and we have to make decisions

22 with respect to our land management plans.

23 As it's proposed now in the DEIS the pipeline

24 project would not conform to the BLM or the Forest Service's

25 current land management plans.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

13

PM4

Continued, page 13 of 162

1 Pacific Connector needs a right-of-way to cross  
2 the federal lands, just like you would for a driveway, I'm  
3 sure many of you have a BLM easement or a right-of-way to  
4 get to your property. And Pacific Connector is no  
5 different, they have to apply. And they have applied with  
6 the BLM to get a right-of-way. The BLM has the authority to  
7 grant it, that's what comes to us from the Mineral Leasing  
8 Act of 1920. So the BLM would consider the grant  
9 application and issue or deny a grant. And the Forest  
10 Service and reclamation would give their concurrence or not.  
11 We would ask for it.

12 No decisions have been made yet with respect to  
13 the right-of-way grant, and none of them will be made until  
14 we've seen the final environmental impact statement and all  
15 the conditions we need to make our decision have been met,  
16 and there are many of them. So, again, as FERC has said, I  
17 want to also reiterate, that no decisions have been made  
18 yet.

19 The pipeline, if it's constructed, would not  
20 conform to the provisions, as I said, and so it needs to  
21 before we can consider a right-of-way grant. And therefore  
22 we would need to amend certain aspects of our land  
23 management plan so that the pipeline could conform and  
24 that's what the amendments are about.

25 We both have BLM and Forest Service both have

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

14

PM4

Continued, page 14 of 162

1 policies in place that allow us to amend those plans and  
2 that's what we're using to do it. The amendments would  
3 consider the project that we would consider are detailed in  
4 the draft EIS. There are 20 of them. For the BLM they will  
5 affect the Coos Bay district, the Roseburg District here,  
6 the Medford District, and the Klamath Falls District of our  
7 lake -- or Klamath Falls Resource Area of our Lake View  
8 District.

9 And for the Forest Service these are impacting  
10 the Umpqua National Forest, the Red River National Forest  
11 and the the Siuslaw National Forest. I'm sorry, Winema.

12 Twenty amendments are described in the draft EIS.  
13 Four of them are for BLM, 15 are for the Forest Service, and  
14 one is a joint amendment for both agencies. The amendments  
15 are addressing issues that relate to our survey and managed  
16 guidelines. Habitat retention for the Northern Spotted Owl  
17 and for the marbled murrelet and then other environmental  
18 conditions that relate to soils, visual quality objectives,  
19 issues in riparian areas, and there's a proposal to  
20 reallocate some of our matrix acres which is where we have  
21 our timber base and over to Lake Sisenal reserves to  
22 mitigate impacts to the Lake Sisenal reserves due to the  
23 pipeline crossing.

24 These are actions that we need to consider  
25 through the NEPA process and so we will use FERC's EIS to do

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

15

PM4

Continued, page 15 of 162

1 that. But our decisions are our own and they will be made  
2 in a separate record of decision. But your opportunity to  
3 comment is concurrent and is part of FERC's. So to comment  
4 on the BLM and the Forest Service actions, you need to  
5 comment through FERC's process. And those comments will  
6 come to us and we will address them. But I want to be clear  
7 about that, don't send your comments directly to us, you  
8 need to use the FERC process.

9 Your comments tonight will go in the record, as  
10 Paul has or will tell you. And you can also comment in  
11 writing. With that I will give your attention back to Paul  
12 and thank you very much. We're glad to have you here.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Miriam. We are  
15 currently at the beginning of a 90-day period for taking  
16 comments on the DEIS. Comments can be filed with the  
17 Commission up until February 13th, 2015. The FERC keeps the  
18 consolidated record for these proceedings for all of the  
19 federal cooperating agencies. So, please, do not send your  
20 comments to the BLM and the Forest Service. Also the FERC  
21 only considers comments put into the public record of the  
22 FERC through our website, through the e-library system. You  
23 go to [WWW.FERC.gov](http://WWW.FERC.gov) click on e-library and you can see  
24 everything that's in the public record. There are some  
25 organizations out there that are providing misinformation to

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

16

PM4

Continued, page 16 of 162

1 the public and telling the public to send me e-mails. Those  
2 e-mails are not considered by the FERC. Do not send me  
3 e-mails.

4 Instead, following directions in the notice of  
5 availability and what I'm going to tell you right now.  
6 There are several ways to provide the FERC with your  
7 comments. First, you can use the e-comment feature on the  
8 FERC web page, which as I said before is WWW.FERC.gov.

9 Second, you can use the e-filing feature on the  
10 FERC web page.

11 Third, you can write a letter to the Secretary of  
12 the Commission whose address is 888 First Street, Northeast,  
13 Washington, D.C. 20426. Remember to always mark your  
14 comments with the docket number CP13-483-000 for Jordan Cove  
15 and CP13-492-000 for Pacific Connector.

16 Lastly, you can give oral comments here at this  
17 meeting and those will be transcribed and put into the FERC  
18 public record. All comments received whether written or  
19 oral will be given equal weight by the FERC staff and will  
20 be addressed at our final EIS. It does not matter if your  
21 comments were submitted on the first day that the DEIS was  
22 issued, on November 7th, or are received on the last day, on  
23 February 13th, 2015. While the purpose of tonight's meeting  
24 is make verbal comments on the DEIS, given the limited time  
25 each presenter will have at this forum, I urge you to send

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

17

PM4

Continued, page 17 of 162

1 more detailed comments in to the FERC either electronically  
2 or in writing. The more specific your comments, the better  
3 we can address your comments.

4 Comments such as I am against the project or I am  
5 in favor of the project are not particularly helpful. This  
6 is not an election and it's not a popularity contest, it's  
7 an environmental review and so we ask you to have your  
8 comments address the environmental issues raised in the  
9 DEIS.

10 After the comment period ends on February 13th,  
11 2014, the FERC staff and our third-party contractor together  
12 with the federal cooperating agencies will review all  
13 comments and address them in the FEIS. The FERC will issue  
14 a notice of schedule in the near future that will present a  
15 new date for the issuance of the FEIS and a 90-day period  
16 for other federal authorizations.

17 No decision about approving or not approving the  
18 project has been made at this time. The EIS is not a  
19 decision document.

20 Only after taking into consideration the findings  
21 contained in the EIS together with other non-environmental  
22 issues such as rates and markets will the Commission make  
23 its decision about whether or not to authorize the project.  
24 If the Commission authorizes the project in a Commission  
25 order, only parties to the proceeding known as intervenors

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

18

PM4

Continued, page 18 of 162

1 may legally question that decision.

2           The FERC's requirements for filing a motion to  
3 intervene can be found under Title 18 Code of Federal  
4 Regulations Part 385-124. While the period for filing a  
5 motion to intervene has passed, the Commission will consider  
6 requests for late intervention with good cause. Typically  
7 affected land owners and those with legitimate environmental  
8 concerns who cannot be represented by another party are  
9 considered to have good cause for intervention.

10           However, simply filing a comment will not give  
11 you intervenor status. But you do not need to be an  
12 intervenor to have your environmental comments considered.  
13 An intervenor may seek rehearing on the Commission's order.

14           If the Commission authorizes the project,  
15 construction may not begin until after Jordan Cove and  
16 Pacific Connector obtain all other necessary federal permits  
17 and approvals. At a minimum, this includes a biological  
18 opinion from the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National  
19 Marines Fishery Service under the Endangered Species Act.  
20 As Miriam said, they need a right-of-way grant for the  
21 Pacific Connector pipeline issued by the BLM under the  
22 Minerals Leasing Act and concurred with by the Forest  
23 Service and reclamation. There have to be permits issued by  
24 the Corps of Engineers under Section 10 of the Rivers and  
25 Harbors Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

19

PM4

Continued, page 19 of 162

1 Oregon Department of Environmental Quality must issue a  
2 water quality certification under Section 401 of the Clean  
3 Water Act and air permits under the Clean Air Act.

4 And a determination must be made by the Oregon  
5 Department of Land Conservation and Development that the  
6 project would be consistent with the Coastal Zone Management  
7 Act.

8 And, lastly, the Energy Facilities Citing Council  
9 of the Oregon Department of Energy must approved the  
10 proposed South Dune Power Plant associated with the Jordan  
11 Cove terminal.

12 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector must document  
13 that all preconstruction conditions of the FERC's order have  
14 been met before we will allow construction to begin.  
15 Construction activities will be monitored by the FERC staff  
16 and the federal land managing agencies.

17 Now, at last we've come to the best part of the  
18 meeting where you the public get to speak. I remind you the  
19 purpose of this meeting is to hear comments from the public  
20 on our DEIS. In general, I will not be responding to your  
21 comments tonight unless you ask an administrative question  
22 that I may know the answer to. Otherwise I will just be  
23 listening.

24 We will address your comments that you give at  
25 this meeting in the final EIS after we do the appropriate

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

20

PM4

Continued, page 20 of 162

1 research.

2           So here are some ground rules for tonight's  
3 meeting. After I call your name, please come up to the  
4 podium and speak clearly into the microphone, it's the  
5 microphone for speakers there (indicating). I'm going to  
6 call like three or four people up at a time to stand in a  
7 line. We've got a lot of people who want to speak and I  
8 intend to hear everyone I can until the college throws us  
9 out.

10           We need you to identify yourself and spell your  
11 name for the court reporter. If you represent an  
12 organization, speak the name of that organization. If you  
13 are a landowner along the pipeline route, provide us with  
14 the approximate milepost for your property or an address or  
15 cross street.

16           If you have a written summary of your comments,  
17 please give that to the Tetrattech team at the back and we  
18 will make certain it gets into the public record.

19           My number one rule, show respect to all speakers  
20 whether you agree with them or not. Please no cheering and  
21 no booing. Lastly, because of the large number of speakers  
22 we have tonight, we're going to limit each person's oral  
23 speech to three minutes. Mr. Busch here has a card. At two  
24 and a half minutes he'll show you yellow, at three minutes  
25 he'll show you red, at that time we would like you to step



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

21

1 away from the microphone and allow another speaker to speak.  
2 With that, I am going to go over to my seat and  
3 pull up the speaker's list and we're going to start.  
4 (Applause.)  
5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. I'm going to call four  
6 names at a time. Dennis Coplin, Leroy Marley, Bob Hoehne,  
7 and Sam Sprague.  
8 MR. COPLIN: Good evening, my name is Dennis  
9 Coplin, D-e-n-n-i-s, C-o-p-l-i-n. I represent UA Local 290,  
10 Plumbers and Steamfitters. I'm the director of political  
11 and legislative affairs for this union. We represent over  
12 4,300 members, many of them living in southwest Oregon.  
13 With that being said, we would like to speak in support of  
14 this project. No big shock there, but the purpose behind  
15 that is there are over 300,000 miles of pipeline crossing  
16 the United States in just about every state in the United  
17 States. It is the safest means of transporting petroleum  
18 products, gas and chemicals known to man. Just about any  
19 other means of transport is more dangerous.  
20 Now, we want this project, but first and  
21 foremost, we want to be assured and we want the people here  
22 that own the land that this pipeline may cross, if it is  
23 approved, to be properly compensated, to work fairly with  
24 them.  
25 Now, again, with that being said, there are

**PM4 Continued, page 21 of 162**

PM4-1 Comment noted.

| PM4-1

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

22

PM4

Continued, page 22 of 162

1 always going to be those that are going to object to it.  
2 Dating back to the '30s and '40s when the first pipelines  
3 came across, we used eminent domain in some areas to get  
4 those done. Had eminent domain not been used in some form  
5 or fashion, we wouldn't see the roads, we wouldn't see the  
6 infrastructure that we have in the United States. It must  
7 be used in some cases. There are just no other  
8 alternatives. Whether you like that or not, it's just a  
9 fact of life. But we want these owners to be properly  
10 compensated to be taken care of and to work with them to do  
11 it safely. We know as experts on pipelines, we build most  
12 of the pipelines in the United States, the UA did, with the  
13 help of others in the building trades. We build them safe,  
14 we try and honor and work with the owners. When we pull out  
15 of that property, in many cases, it was in better condition  
16 afterwards than it was before.

17 It is known that most of these pipelines are a  
18 natural fire break when it comes to forestry. It really  
19 helps in the case of wildfires. So there are a lot of  
20 advantages, there are disadvantages, but, please, work with  
21 the owners and make sure that it is done fairly.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Leroy Marley.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

23

PM4

Continued, page 23 of 162

1 MR. MARLEY: Hi, my name is Leroy Marley. I'm a  
2 representative for Labors Local 121 which has a lot of  
3 members in this area and around t his state. I'm also Vice  
4 President of the Land Coos Curry Douglas Building Trades.

5 I believe everybody in this room is wanting  
6 cleaner energy to move into the future, and I'm one of them.  
7 And I think LNG is one of the fuels that we need for a  
8 bridge or a transition fuel to get there. And I think this  
9 project of fair treatment of property owners is very  
10 important.

11 I guess that's about all I have.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Bob Hoehne.

15 MR. HOEHNE: That's Hoehne, H-o-e-h-n-e. Yeah,  
16 I'm a member of a union too. I'm not representing them here  
17 today and I hate to speak in opposition of my brothers and  
18 unions, because I certainly support jobs and so forth. My  
19 dad was a union leader, but I don't think this project is  
20 wise on many different fronts. Climate change is going on  
21 and it's not the cleanest source of energy. I don't think  
22 we should be exporting a lot of our natural resources. We  
23 will need them ourselves some day.

24 But the main reason I want to talk to you about  
25 today is I've grown up fishing and fishing is part of my

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

24

PM4

Continued, page 24 of 162

1 life. I feed my family from the fish. I've done river  
2 conservation for 35 years. I coordinated the Umpqua river  
3 cleanup for 25 of those years. The springers on the south  
4 Umpqua river are near extinction. Many groups -- agencies  
5 are doing a lot of volunteer work to bring back and restore  
6 the fisheries. This is going to definitely harm them. I  
7 don't care what anybody says, tearing up the land, putting a  
8 three-foot pipeline over this rough country through this  
9 coastline, I think is absurd, really, myself. It's  
10 horrendous that you're even thinking about doing it.

11 And also that these pipelines -- this gentleman  
12 says they're safe, and they might be safe this way to  
13 transport some of this energy, but we know across the  
14 country that they are not safe. They blow up, they leak.  
15 These pipes are going to be in there for how long. Our  
16 grandchildren -- I don't want my grandchildren to come  
17 through some day and be able to fish and enjoy these rivers  
18 and streams and not have them polluted. The chance of them  
19 leaking in the future or blowing up, which we know they do  
20 sometimes. It's not a matter of if they're going to do it,  
21 it's a matter of when. Because they all leak eventually  
22 when they get old and so forth.

23 So I oppose this and I appreciate your time.

| PM4-2

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

25 (Applause.)

PM4-2

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

25

PM4

Continued, page 25 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm going to call up a group of  
2 speakers now. So, Sam, wait a sec. Sam Sprague, Francis  
3 Earthington, Al Shropshire, and Patricia Lara.  
4 And, Sam, now it's your turn.  
5 MR. SPRAGUE: My name is Sam Sprague,  
6 S-p-r-a-g-u-e. I'm descended from James and Jane Jordan,  
7 the namesake of this energy project. I'm a member of the  
8 Coos Lower Umpqua Siuslaw tribe. I sit on the culture  
9 committee, I'm the chairman. And I speak for myself today.  
10 I speak for my family. And as a tribal member, this place  
11 is a very important place to us. It's very sensitive areas.  
12 You're putting pipelines through rivers basically. It's  
13 kind of an absurd thing like that gentleman was saying.  
14 But on another front, I go to the University of  
15 Oregon, I'm an environmental studies student and we're  
16 learning about the impacts of climate change, the impacts of  
17 CH<sub>4</sub>, methane gas, and how it can be actually quite a bit  
18 worse than carbon dioxide. And keeping leakage to a minimum  
19 is going to be a tough deal no matter how well you build  
20 this thing. And with the amount of warming and methane  
21 that's being released already, I don't think it's wise to  
22 use this as a bridge. I think if we're going to invest in  
23 cleaner energy, we need to invest in cleaner energy, not a  
24 bridge energy.  
25 I'm for jobs. I'm from Coos Bay too. I know

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

26

1 everybody needs jobs down there. It's the meth capital of  
2 the world. You know when people need money to live, we want  
3 to bring up our standard of living, but it comes to a point  
4 where, what projects d you support and at what point do you  
5 draw the line. And I feel like, this project in particular,  
6 crossing rivers with pipelines, like the gentleman said,  
7 which obviously are made of steel in a climate that is not  
8 nice to steel.

9 I used to work on a fishing boat, I know a lot  
10 about that. And it just seems like it's a short-term  
11 solution and we'll be the ones dealing with it, travel  
12 members, because it's our homeland. We'll be dealing with  
13 it for the next however many generations we're around.

14 So, I would urge you to think about the long-term  
15 impacts of this and the cumulative effects which I didn't  
16 see in the DEIS of actually making more gas be drilled.  
17 Because once this pipeline goes in, it's going to be cheaper  
18 to export it. It's going to be a lot more likely that more  
19 wells will be drilled. And if we're going to seriously  
20 combat climate change, we can't be investing in  
21 infrastructure that's going to continue our trajectory down  
22 that road.

23 What else? I've also, since I'm on the culture  
24 committee I hear from our archeologist that she's been  
25 working with the Jordon Cove people on shelled mittens that

PM4-3

**PM4**

**Continued, page 26 of 162**

PM4-3

Drilling for natural gas is not considered an effect of the proposed action. The FERC does not regulate natural gas exploration, production, or gathering activities, as explained in section 1.4.4 of the DEIS. See the response to IND1-2.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

27

1 have been found in pipeline routes. And it's gone back and  
2 forth with so many routes that I don't know if she knows, I  
3 don't know, which route it is they're doing now or like if  
4 that's on the route where there's village sites or what not,  
5 but in the DEIS there was very little mention, there was a  
6 paragraph about this big (indicating) that just basically  
7 said, we're talking to the tribes and we'll continue to talk  
8 to the tribes. And I think if you're going to seriously  
9 carry out a cultural resources impact statement it would be  
10 nice to be more of a part of that.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Francis.

15 So Francis is next and then Al Shropshire,  
16 Patricia Lara and then Susan Applegate. Can you come up and  
17 line up behind Francis so we can go as quickly as possible.

18 FRANCIS: Hello?

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: We can hear you just fine.

20 FRANCIS: Pardon me?

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: You're coming off loud and clear.

22 FRANCIS: Okay. So I would like to talk about  
23 some specific things in the DEIS right now and one of the  
24 things I want to talk about is the maps that were provided  
25 us. And as you know, you've heard from me complaining that

PM4-4

**PM4**

**Continued, page 27 of 162**

**PM4-4**

The DEIS documents the interactions between the consulted Indian tribes, Native American organizations, FERC, Jordan Cove, and Pacific Connector. Due to the sensitive nature of resources shared by the tribes, additional detail is not provided in the document. However, the nature of concerns that have been expressed are presented (see section 4.11.1.2, pages 4-853 through 4-860 of the DEIS). Further, the Project will not be allowed to begin construction until all agreements with consulted tribes are in place (see pages 8-59 through 8-60 and 4-873 of the DEIS).

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

28

PM4

Continued, page 28 of 162

1 the maps were so poor. Thank you for providing us --  
2 getting us some of the better maps. But many of the maps we  
3 can't get because the contractors own them and they don't  
4 want to give up their data. And it's very difficult for us  
5 to go out and check this pipeline on the ground with the  
6 kind of maps that we've been given.

7 Now, the best kind of maps that we would like is  
8 the GIES data maps. However, we have been refused the best  
9 maps because we were told that if we were given the real  
10 detailed maps of the pipeline route a competitor -- and this  
11 is a quote, "a competitor could locate and construct a  
12 competing pipeline."

13 (Laughter.)

14 FRANCIS: Now, that's a pretty ridiculous  
15 statement for not giving us good GIS data maps. But what's  
16 not funny is the next reason we were told we couldn't get  
17 good maps, and that is because someone who might get this  
18 good map data could blow up the pipeline. I mean, they said  
19 that, quote, "Pacific Connector would suffer substantial  
20 harm if its facilities were subject to attack when these  
21 kind of details are done." Now, that's pretty scary that  
22 you think that if we have good maps someone could blow up  
23 the pipeline, especially since the GIS data will be  
24 available anyway. You can see it all on Google Earth after  
25 the pipeline is built. So you're going to put this in my



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

29

1 yard? You know, you even refused to send me the GIS maps  
2 for my property that it's going through much less the public  
3 land that it's going through. And I think that is pretty  
4 poor.

5 So -- and you know, if you think that if good  
6 maps -- if they're going to see it on Google Earth and  
7 someone could blow it up if they could see it on Google  
8 Earth, you should have put that in the DEIS. You should  
9 have said, attack and the DEIS consider that it was going to  
10 get blown up because people obviously are going to see it.  
11 The reason -- the only reason I can see that you're really  
12 withholding this good map data from us is to inhibit good  
13 comments. You know, to keep the public from being as  
14 involved as they can be and to see exactly what it is that  
15 you're doing.

16 And speaking of safety, okay, you're going to put  
17 this in my yard, it could get blown up, one of the big  
18 problems with safety is that we live in what is known as a  
19 class one area. There are less than ten families living  
20 along one mile of the pipeline route. This is through most  
21 of Douglas County, through most of southern Oregon, we're  
22 considered class one, and therefore you're going to reduce  
23 the safety of the pipeline in our places in order to enhance  
24 the Canadian company's profits so they don't have to spend  
25 as much money, they get to use thinner pipes, they get to

PM4-5

**PM4**

**Continued, page 29 of 162**

PM4-5

Current laws and regulations require priority information to be withheld from public release.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

30

PM4

Continued, page 30 of 162

1 bury it higher, they could use less welds, they get to use  
2 less inspections, all because we're rural and if it blows  
3 up, only a few of us will die.

4 And I think --

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments,  
6 Francis.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: I understand that we have a very  
9 enthusiastic crowd here tonight, but I do want to reiterate  
10 showing respect and that means let's refrain, if possible,  
11 from cheering, and of course absolutely no booing. Okay.

12 The next speaker is Al Shropshire.

13 MR. SHROPSHIRE: Good evening, my name is Al  
14 Shropshire, that's S-h-r-o-p-s-h-i-r-e. And I represent  
15 Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 290. We have 4,300 members,  
16 most of which live in the state of Oregon. And we are  
17 experts in building large industrial plants and pipelines.  
18 And I just want to say for everybody that's worried about  
19 the pipeline blowing up, that these things are built to the  
20 highest safety standards possible and that our members weld  
21 these pipelines and install these things and they do an  
22 excellent job at it. And the engineering and safety  
23 standards are the highest in the world.

24 We all want jobs and our members don't want jobs  
25 at the expense of the environment. I do think though that

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

31

PM4

Continued, page 31 of 162

1 we need jobs and that we can have both.

2 I want to thank the panel for being here tonight  
3 and allowing everybody to speak. And our members are  
4 certain that when all the evidence is in, that this project  
5 will go forward.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Now, we have Patrick Lara, Susan  
10 Applegate, Perry Brean and Pam Driscoll. And please line up  
11 behind Patrick.

12 MR. LARA: Patrick Lara, L-a-r-a. Just a little  
13 bit towards the bigger picture. I spent the better part of  
14 --

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: You have to stand closer to the  
16 mike so that -- the reason we need the mike --

17 MR. LARA: I spent the better part of the last  
18 two days driving around Coos Bay, Roseburg, visiting all the  
19 high schools, trade schools, employment centers and, you  
20 know, in the efforts of recruiting apprentices from this  
21 area, Coos Bay area, you know, to possibly work out at the  
22 LNG plant.

23 I just want to say here tonight, you know, I was  
24 met with open arms and enthusiasm from, you know, high  
25 schools. You know, I mean, they were overly excited to hear

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

32

PM4

Continued, page 32 of 162

1 that there was an alternative to college. Something else  
2 these kids can do that can't afford such things. Or, you  
3 know, maybe they're not even -- they don't even want to  
4 think about the long-term.  
5       You know, being a proud member of a labor  
6 organization, you know, it teaches you things like  
7 craftsmanship. It teaches you things like solidarity,  
8 loyalty, among other things leadership.  
9       Now, if I could reach just a few kids from this  
10 community, show them that there was more out there, show  
11 them that they were bigger than Wal-Mart, bigger than Burger  
12 King, And I was to give them the knowledge to put behind  
13 those tools to go out to places like the LNG plant, do the  
14 welding process, build the structural, you know, apply those  
15 skills they're going to learn through these apprenticeships  
16 from these unions. And ladies and gentlemen, I'm only one  
17 construction worker that could possibly be going out to this  
18 LNG plant. Okay. So, if I'm only one guy and that's what  
19 I'm willing to do for your community and that's what my  
20 purpose is, my goal, imagine what a few thousand of us could  
21 do.  
22       Thank you.  
23       MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
24       (Applause.)  
25       MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Susan

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

33

PM4

Continued, page 33 of 162

1 Applegate.  
2 MS. APPELGATE: S-u-s-a-n A-p-p-l-e-g-a-t-e.  
3 This is a very troubling project for me. For one thing, the  
4 environmental impacts of piping liquefied natural gas,  
5 methane, through pipes through this very rugged, yet  
6 sensitive terrain, terrain that has hundreds of streams that  
7 would need to be crossed or dug beneath using materials that  
8 would have been known to kill fish. If there's any at all  
9 problems in the laying of the bentonite, and this methane,  
10 as we know, has been known to leak in other pipes throughout  
11 the United States and in Canada and in Alaska. And because  
12 we are in this rural area, the gas that would be used -- I  
13 mean, the methane that is going to be going through these  
14 pipes is going to be non-odorous, which means that you  
15 really don't know when it's leaking.  
16 And the fragile, yet rugged nature of these  
17 mountains, many -- much of it through BLM U.S. Forest  
18 Service and much of it through areas where we have river  
19 crossings are also on fault lines and we are promised  
20 earthquakes. I think that if it can happen, it probably  
21 will. And the longevity of this project, when we think  
22 about how many years into the future, even the Pentagon, and  
23 a very esteemed panel of scientists who are giving their  
24 highest technical opinions on projects like these are  
25 saying, we must stop putting greenhouse gases into our

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

34

1 atmosphere. We're seeing deleterious effects right now.  
2 And in 50 years we'll even see more. This is an  
3 environmental impact and even though it may be that FERC  
4 will not allow us to talk about greenhouse gas emissions and  
5 global climate change, we citizens are very concerned about  
6 these things.

7 We also -- I am also very concerned about a  
8 tsunami happening at the terminal site, built on sand, this  
9 terminal is very fragile --

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: I know you want to bring your  
11 comments to a conclusion.

12 MS. APPELEGATE: Thank you very much for allowing  
13 me to comment.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. And if you have more  
15 detailed comments, remember you can put them in writing and  
16 send them to FERC.

17 MS. APPELEGATE: I am going to be doing that.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Perry Bream.

21 MR. BREAM: Perry with a P like papa, B-r-e-a-m.  
22 First a quick question, something that Susan touched on. I  
23 had heard before I came here that any comments that we made  
24 that concerned climate were to be disregarded. And --

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: I will correct that right now. If

PM4-6

**PM4**

**Continued, page 34 of 162**

PM4-6

Climate change was addressed in section 4.14.3.12 of the DEIS. Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project were discussed in section 4.12.1.4 of the DEIS. See response to IND1-1.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

35

PM4

Continued, page 35 of 162

1 anyone reads the DEIS, you will see a very lengthy  
2 discussion on greenhouse gases and climate change.  
3 MR. BREAM: Thank you for making that clear. I  
4 appreciate that. I have a background working on tugs and  
5 tow boats for over 12 years about Peugeot Sound. I'm a  
6 member of Master Mates and Pilots. I was a chief mate. I  
7 have a master -- I'm a member of the Inland Boatmans Union.  
8 I was a chief engineer and we towed an awful lot of  
9 different things, or bumped a lot of ships and some of these  
10 had to do with fuels, everything from propane to gasoline to  
11 diesel. And I just wanted to relate one incident that I am  
12 privy to and my real concern here is safety.

13 I mean, we think about things like deep water  
14 horizon, and the catastrophic results. And I'm sure there  
15 was at least one, if not many environmental impact  
16 statements and safety processes that they went through and  
17 those all got checked off by somebody and we know the  
18 results from that.

19 Well, this one incident that I -- that I was  
20 witness to was we had a 400-foot barge, that's like longer  
21 than a football field, that we put through a dock up in  
22 Seattle. And they were just loading it with diesel oil.  
23 Normally you wouldn't think anything more about that than  
24 you'd think about a barge that was loaded with water. But,  
25 of course, there were very strict procedures in place. We

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

36

PM4

Continued, page 36 of 162

1 would take the barge in and we would leave and then the crew  
2 from the facility would take over. Somebody, one time,  
3 forgot to hook up a grounding strap, that disconnected the  
4 barge to essentially like a lightning rod on the shore and  
5 before the barge was filled up we heard this boom that  
6 sounded like a big bass drum. And when we came over, this  
7 thing that looked like a flat football field all of a sudden  
8 looked like a sand dune. And this was just from the gas  
9 that evanescens off the top of diesel fuel. The fuel didn't  
10 catch fire, there was no big explosion, but having seen that  
11 happen, it's different when you actually see it.

12 And you think about liquefied natural gas, that  
13 isn't just -- practically all of that is in a gaseous form.  
14 And if something as simple as that it was static electricity  
15 that created the spark that set that barge off. I would  
16 really encourage whoever is in charge of this to take very,  
17 very seriously looking back through past accidents, whatever  
18 is there on record and making sure --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20 MR. BREAM: Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Pam Driscoll  
23 and after Pam I'd like Frank Adams, Joseph Quinn, Bill  
24 Rodgers, and Carol Hanrahan to come up and stand behind Pam  
25 so that you're ready to speak.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

37

PM4

Continued, page 37 of 162

1 MS. DRISCOLL: My name is Pam Driscoll, that's  
2 P-a-m D-r-i-s-c-o-l-l. I've been studying and researching  
3 climate change for 18 years. We are in deep doo-doo.  
4 According to a recent New York Times Article, December 1st  
5 of 2014, after more than two decades trying, but failing to  
6 forge a global pact to hot climate change U.N. negotiators  
7 gathering in South America this week are expressing new  
8 optimism as they finally achieved the elusive deal. But  
9 underlying that optimism is a grim reality. No matter the  
10 outcome of the talks, experts caution it probably will not  
11 be enough to stave off increasingly significant, near-term  
12 impact of global warming.

13 At stake now they say is the difference between a  
14 newly unpleasant world and an uninhabitable one. What part  
15 of that do we not understand? We are headed towards the  
16 abyss of mass extinctions and this could include humans.  
17 That's not an overstatement.

18 Okay. So fast forward or go back to November  
19 22nd, 2014, LNG plant would emit greenhouse gases from the  
20 Associated Press. A proposed liquefied natural gas terminal  
21 in Coos Bay would become one of the largest sources of  
22 greenhouse gases in Oregon federal data shows. The  
23 assessment came as the Jordan Cove energy project seeks  
24 permission to release 2.1 million metric tons of greenhouse  
25 gases annually according to the environment analysis from

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

38

PM4

Continued, page 38 of 162

1 energy regulators.

2 Okay. So climate change is happening, it's  
3 really bad, and we're talking about human extinction. So  
4 why would we invest in more -- more pipelines. Death of a  
5 1,000 cuts.

6 Okay. So safety. May 2009, former CIA official  
7 warns against LNG terminal. According to Charles Fadis,  
8 retired head of the CIA's Weapons of Mass Destruction  
9 Terrorism Unit, security is a safety issue. The explosive  
10 power of the LNG operation may be too good a target for  
11 terrorists to pass up. The energy content of a single  
12 standard LNG tankard is equivalent to seven tons of a  
13 megaton of TNT or 55 Hiroshima bombs. If an LNG facility  
14 were to explode, it would decimate a 50-mile radius. Okay.

15 Better than coal. In a Washington Post article,  
16 June 9th, 2014, tucked into an Energy Department report, on  
17 LNG exports is a different view that LNG gas is better than  
18 coal for reducing greenhouse gases. U.S. exports of LNG to  
19 China would end up being worse from a greenhouse gas  
20 perspective than if China simply built a new power plant and  
21 burned its own coal supplies.

22 The report also said the climate benefits of  
23 exporting LNG to other countries are modest.

24 So let's just get back to the article in the New  
25 York Times, December 1st. At stake now they say --

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

39

PM4

Continued, page 39 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: So, Pam, your time is up.

2 MS. DRISCOLL: -- is a difference between a  
3 really unpleasant world and an uninhabitable one. Thank  
4 you.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Frank Adams.

8 MR. ADAMS: Frank Adams, F-r-a-n-k, A-d-a-m-s,  
9 1731 Ireland Road, Milepost 55.5.

10 Having come from a military background, when the  
11 pipeline first was proposed and they tried to come through  
12 taking interviews and trying to get on the land for surveys  
13 and that sort of thing, I had my questions back then about  
14 environmental concerns. How is this going to benefit myself  
15 and my family and their families? And I found that it was a  
16 zero. It was not a good thing.

17 The more lies that were told to me about what it  
18 was going to do and what I was going to have and how it was  
19 going to benefit me, the less and less it seemed like those  
20 were really things that were going to benefit me. It was  
21 going to benefit a foreign power which was the Canadians and  
22 the Chinese. I have many personal concerns for my own  
23 property. I've lived on the property for 33 years. This is  
24 my home. I fought for two and a half years in the Republic  
25 of Vietnam so that people couldn't come by and use eminent

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

40

PM4

Continued, page 40 of 162

1 domain to take my land away from me and use it for a purpose  
2 that I disagreed with.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. ADAMS: Water is the life blood of everybody  
5 that's here. Whether you just turn on the tap and you live  
6 in the city, or you live out in the country and you have a  
7 well. Where the proposed pipeline is due to come off of the  
8 mountain, that is where my stream comes to supply my well.

9 My 20-ounce a minute recovery well. I have used that for 33  
10 years. I have never run out of water. But with the  
11 blasting and the digging that they're going to do up on that  
12 mountain, it doesn't look like that's a very good thing.

13 I've planted an orchard, grapevines, apple trees,  
14 that sort of thing. When they fly over this pipeline, when  
15 they put it in the ground, where is all this herbicide going  
16 to go? It's going to go on my grapevines and on my  
17 orchards. You expect my children to eat those grapes and to  
18 eat those apples and pears that are in that orchard? I  
19 don't think so.

20 For seven years we've been held in limbo not  
21 knowing whether I can dig a hole, put another post in the  
22 ground, plow it, disk it, anything like that. Couldn't do  
23 it because the proposed pipeline is just going on and on and  
24 on. It's not anything to benefit us.

25 Thank you very much.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

41

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
3 The next speaker is Joseph Quinn.  
4 MR. QUINN: Joseph Patrick Quinn, Q-u-i-n-n,  
5 volunteer conservation chair for Umpqua Watersheds  
6 Incorporated. I did not read all 5,000-some-odd pages. I  
7 glossed them, but to judge for myself the integrity of that  
8 document, I turned right away to section four to the  
9 geologic section. And I know because I made some comments  
10 and others I know did too, about the cascadeous abduction  
11 zone, et cetera. Now, in there you read, don't worry about  
12 a thing. We saw what happened at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan  
13 where they just had a reinforced concrete wall that sunk  
14 three feet and in come the water. Don't worry, we're going  
15 to pile up sand. We'll put a vibratory roller on it and if  
16 it looks like we need to, we'll reinforce it with a little  
17 cement. Does that encourage you? It doesn't me.  
18 They tell you, landslides, with the pipeline  
19 itself, it is recognized that the consequences of a pipeline  
20 failure may be catastrophic and involve fire, and/or  
21 explosion, but don't worry about a thing. We'll get out  
22 there and we'll fix it.  
23 People ask, when they said there would be  
24 approximately 90 of those vessels and they're big vessels,  
25 coming into Coos Bay, that's one every four days. What's

PM4-7

PM4

Continued, page 41 of 162

PM4-7

All LNG facilities in the area affected by the Tsunami survived with only minor damage.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

42

1 going to happen if it's tied up and it's half loaded with  
2 LNG and the big one lets go? Not the 80 or 70, they talk  
3 about, but the 9 to 9.5 OSU geologists talk about it. Well,  
4 don't worry about a thing. We'll send a cab down to the gin  
5 joint to get the crew. We'll untie it, we'll disconnect the  
6 pipes. We'll round up the three tug boats, we got 20, 25  
7 minutes, we'll get it out in the channel. We'll turn it bow  
8 onto the wave, nobody knows just how big it's going to be.  
9 Does anybody in this room think that has any chance of  
10 success? If so, there's a bridge in Brooklyn I want to try  
11 and sell you. It will never work. Never.  
12 I will be filing written comments at a later  
13 date.  
14 (Applause.)  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
16 Bill Rodgers.  
17 MR. RODGERS: Bill Rodgers, that's R-o-d-g-e-r-s.  
18 Climate scientists almost unanimously are warning us, but  
19 unless we make major reductions in our use of fossil fuels  
20 and do so quickly, we are very likely to see increasingly  
21 extreme and frequent weather events such as droughts, heat  
22 waves, and hurricanes.  
23 Specifically, if we use more than a small  
24 fraction, perhaps just 20 percent of the reserves the fossil  
25 fuel is currently claimed by energy corporations, we may

PM4-8

## PM4

## Continued, page 42 of 162

PM4-8

See section 4.4.13.6 for a discussion of hazards associated with transporting LNG. As the incident history detailed in the section shows, LNG tanker incidents are uncommon and those that have occurred have not resulted in harm to the public (see section 4.13.6.1).

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

43

1 well push climate change past survivable limits.  
2 To ignore this threat and to focus instead on  
3 alternative ways to transport natural gas from the Western  
4 U.S. to Asia seems short sighted. Yet in the 5,000 or so  
5 pages of the DEIS, I found just one short seven-line  
6 paragraph that directly addresses the issue. Section 3.1.4.  
7 There the suggestion that the project could be replaced by  
8 renewable energy alternatives is summarily dismissed in just  
9 33 words, and I quote, "Because the project's purpose is to  
10 prepare natural gas for export to foreign and domestic  
11 markets, the development or use of renewable energy  
12 technology would not be a reasonable alternative to the  
13 proposed action."  
14 On the contrary, I would argue that this is a  
15 highly reasonable alternative and that all of the  
16 alternatives considered in the DEIS are short-sighted and  
17 suicidal.  
18 Renewable technology has become a major source of  
19 annual increments in energy production. But we need to  
20 accelerate this transition. Sending tankers of LNG to China  
21 and Japan, however, may very well mean that those countries  
22 and other countries will slow down their development of the  
23 renewable energy sources.  
24 So for the sake of my children's and my  
25 grandchildren's generations, I urge that you think outside

PM4-9

**PM4**

**Continued, page 43 of 162**

PM4-9

FERC is analyzing the project in Jordan Cove's application. The project seeks to convert natural gas to a liquid form and export it; the statement explains why we are not analyzing renewable energy resources.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

44

1 the box, the box in which you claim you are confined of the  
2 project's purpose. I ask that you focus on the best way to  
3 transport fossil fuel from point A to point B without first  
4 asking whether it is not in our collective interests to  
5 leave that fuel back at point A.

6 Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

9 The next group of speakers, I would like you to  
10 come up behind Carol. We have Carol Hanrahan, Stuart  
11 Liebowitz, Cindy Haws, and Araya Jensen.

12 MS. HANRAHAN: Carol Hanrahan, H-a-n-r-a-h-a-n.

13 I have a couple of hard acts to follow here.

14 I don't want to touch it. Okay.

15 Okay. I also have not had a chance to read the  
16 entire DEIS tome, but I will before February 13th. Anyway,  
17 I don't have any property involved, but I do have -- I come  
18 from a farm and I like land. I don't like to see it messed  
19 with. So that's my issue here.

20 Hopefully the final EIS report will have  
21 something about fracking in it. And also maybe about what  
22 will be done with the water that's going to be used to flush  
23 out the pipes, the pipeline and like where it is going to be  
24 taken from and then where is it going to be deposited to.

25 And also, I guess, I think, my final comment is

PM4-10

PM4-11

## PM4

## Continued, page 44 of 162

### PM4-10

Fracking, or hydraulic fracturing, is used during exploration and production of natural gas. As stated in our response to IND1-2, the FERC does not regulate the exploration or production of natural gas. In fact, fracking is not part of the Project; and therefore, the environmental impacts associated with that activity will not be analyzed in our environmental document. See response to IND1-3.

### PM4-11

As stated in section 4.4.2.2, water for hydrostatic testing would be obtained from commercial or municipal sources, private supply wells, or from surface water right owners (see table 4.4.2.2-10). If water for hydrostatic testing would be acquired from surface water sources, Pacific Connector would obtain all necessary appropriations and withdrawal permits, including from the ODWR, prior to use. As part of this process, ODWR would have the applications reviewed by ODEQ and ODFW to determine if there are concerns about the impact water withdrawals may have on water resources, (including concerns relating to the timing, seasonality, and method of withdrawal), as well as water quality and/or fish and wildlife species and the habitat, respectively. ODWR would provide public notice and opportunity to comment on the applications.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

45

1 that I sort of wonder about the wisdom of whoever chose this  
2 place to put this pipeline. Because it seems like there  
3 could have been some other places that would be easier, you  
4 know, as far as the economy and the geographical location  
5 and the earthquake situation and things like that. And,  
6 plus, you know, there's a lot of other businesses going on  
7 like fishermen, you know, they're going to be having  
8 problems with getting their work done. Tourism, and people  
9 who like to go to the beach like Oregonians who own the  
10 beach, and visitors.

11 So, anyway, those are my comments for this  
12 evening. Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Stuart Liebowitz.

16 MR. LIEBOWITZ: That's S-t-u-a-r-t  
17 L-i-e-b-o-w-i-t-z. As a member of the Douglas County Global  
18 Warming Coalition I strongly oppose the construction of the  
19 Jordon Cove Energy project. It is hellacious to assert this  
20 project does not have an unacceptable impact on climate  
21 change. Data from the Environment Protection Agency shows  
22 that once Oregon's only coal plant closes in 2020, this  
23 project will be the highest greenhouse gas emitter in the  
24 state of Oregon.

25 A recent United Nations report warned that at the

PM4

Continued, page 45 of 162

PM4-12

Climate change was addressed in section 4.14.3.12 of the DEIS. Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project were discussed in section 4.12.1.4 of the DEIS. See response to IND1-1.

PM4-12

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

46

PM4

Continued, page 46 of 162

1 present rate we are burning fossil fuels, and that includes  
2 ill-conceived projects such as Jordan Cove in 30 years were  
3 condemned to a nearly four degree temperature rise or  
4 higher. And during the next 30 years Jordan Cove would add  
5 60 million tons of deadly greenhouse gas pollution to the  
6 atmosphere. We must say no to the Jordan Cove energy  
7 project.

8 President Obama recently set a goal of reducing  
9 greenhouse gas emissions by 28 percent by the year 2030, yet  
10 the United Nations has found that our efforts are being  
11 offset by these dirty fossil fuel exports. We must say no  
12 to the Jordan Cove energy project.

13 The national climate assessment released in March  
14 stated that here in Oregon we are already seeing the  
15 devastating impacts of climate change, ocean acidification,  
16 melting snow packs, and increased wildfires. To protect our  
17 state we must say no to the Jordan Cove energy project. And  
18 according to NOAA, 2014 is on track to become the hottest  
19 year on record. Scientists warn us, we are in a race to  
20 prevent our planet from becoming uninhabitable. Sixty  
21 million tons matter. We must say no to the Jordan Cove  
22 energy project.

23 You hold our future in your hands. I urge you to  
24 find the courage, the rationale to say no to the Jordan Cove  
25 energy project for the sake of the children we cherish, and

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

47

PM4

Continued, page 47 of 162

1 for the grandchildren we adore, and this planet we all call  
2 home. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

5 Next is Cindy Haws.

6 MS. HAWS: Hi, Cindy Haws, C-i-n-d-y H-a-w-s. I

7 ask the Commission -- I'm speaking for -- as a member of the

8 Myrtle Creek Rural Community Association. I ask the

9 Commission not to authorize the project.

10 We are rural family farmers that depend upon

11 protection of our natural resources to produce food and

12 drinking water to support sustainable, long-term

13 livelihoods. That is thousands of rural residents

14 livelihoods as compared to 922 temporary employees mostly

15 from outside our local communities.

16 I support long-term sustainable livelihoods in

17 our community, that is what makes up a healthy community.

18 Short-term jobs combined with the destruction of

19 natural resources creates loss of everyone's livelihoods.

20 The cumulative impacts of climate change is best stated, let

21 the hunger games begin. Because what we are going to do is

22 to make some people very rich and the rest of us very poor

23 trying to raise food with little water. And that's the

24 situation I'm in already because of the cumulative impacts

25 of other activities. And that's why cumulative impacts are

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

48

1 so important to be considered here in terms of the impacts  
2 of our water both indirect impacts to rural residents and  
3 cumulative in terms of climate change.  
4 Our watershed are already significantly degraded.  
5 The project would significantly further degrade our  
6 watersheds. And the mitigation identified does not use  
7 proven measures, but instead unproven models and, as  
8 necessary, actions after something goes wrong in places that  
9 have many fault zones and potential slope instability.  
10 Actions that leave the public with no idea of what would  
11 actually really happen prior to a decision.  
12 The draft environmental impact statement did not  
13 consider the correct scale of cumulative effects. The  
14 project must consider the interconnected and interdependent  
15 actions of fracking, liquefying, chipping, and other methane  
16 producing carbon emissions include associated carbon  
17 emissions with the people that are going to be working there  
18 with all the machines and so on. And the end place where  
19 the LNG gas will actually be emitted into the air in China  
20 or what other Asian country.  
21 This will contribute to climate change that  
22 impacts family farmers who grow food. Up to 9 percent of  
23 methane drilled by fracking escapes into the atmosphere.  
24 This for of greenhouse gas is 86 times worse than other  
25 greenhouse gases. In addition as spoke before the many tons

PM4-13

PM4-14

PM4-15

**PM4**

**Continued, page 48 of 162**

PM4-13

The cumulative effects of this project in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects are addressed in section 4.14 of the DEIS. The Cumulative Effects section discusses climate change in section 4.14.3.12.

PM4-14

The mitigation measures are based on experience in the region. Mitigation proposed by the Forest Service and the BLM has been used successfully for years. FERC's Plan and Procedures were developed over many years of pipeline construction monitoring.

PM4-15

Fracking and drilling for natural gas is not considered an effect of the proposed action. The FERC does not regulate natural gas exploration, production, or gathering activities, as explained in section 1.4.4 of the DEIS. See the response to IND1-2. The process of liquefaction of natural gas at the export facility is addressed in the EIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

49

1 of carbon that will be actually released just to liquefy  
2 this gas.  
3 All the carbon emissions will adversely impact  
4 family farmers and our super food, salmon. I also want to  
5 say that the safety issue I asked FERC to insist upon having  
6 the same kind of safety issue with our pipelines as would be  
7 in a highly populated area.  
8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
9 (Applause.)  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Araya Jensen, then George  
11 Logan, and Bob Carroll. So, George and Bob, come up and  
12 stand up behind Aria.  
13 MS. JENSEN: Araya Jensen.  
14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting me.  
15 MS. JENSEN: A-i-a-y-a Jensen, J-e-n-s-e-n.  
16 Okay. Is this good? Through review of the DEIS,  
17 a couple concerns arose for me. We must look at the spirit  
18 of our laws, not just the word of the law. I push for  
19 uniform safety standards on all sections of the pipeline  
20 regardless of population. A designation only serves to save  
21 costs and does not look out for public safety. In rural  
22 Douglas County high fire danger and unstable topography are  
23 factors that should be taken into account when deciding the  
24 diameter, depth, and distance between shutoff switches.  
25 I encourage more frequent examinations,

PM4-16

PM4-17

**PM4**

**Continued, page 49 of 162**

PM4-16

See the response to IND1-7.

PM4-17

The DOT, not FERC, regulates pipeline safety, they establish the standards associated with Classes 1 through 4. The DEIS discloses the DOT requirements. Revising DOT standards is beyond the scope of this EIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

50

1 especially in the first ten years.  
2 Williams Pipeline has a checkered safety record  
3 and it's important to uphold them on the following statement  
4 made by Tom Drogie in response to a pipeline leak in  
5 Parachute, Colorado. "We know we can't just say we are a  
6 safe, reliable company, we have to demonstrate it through  
7 our actions and have to continually improve."

8 I hope FERC considers how the pipeline will  
9 affect fire suppression. I read in the DEIS that heavy  
10 equipment should not be operated within the pipeline  
11 corridor without personnel. With dozers being a vital part  
12 of wildlife -- wild land firefighting, this could pose an  
13 added risk. I say this as a wild land firefighter in  
14 Douglas County.

15 A huge additional risk is if there is a leak in  
16 the pipeline that causes an explosion or adds additional  
17 fuel to the wild fire. This would definitely complicate  
18 fire suppression. Water cannot be used, heavy equipment  
19 would be delayed, and the explosive properties of liquefied  
20 natural gas would pose a threat to emergency responders.

21 Better safety standards would be an easy way to  
22 reduce risks. The costs of a wildfire can be very  
23 expensive.

24 The 80 million -- I believe it's 80 million  
25 gallons, that seems huge to me, almost impossible, of the

PM4-17  
cont'd

PM4-18

**PM4**

**Continued, page 50 of 162**

PM4-18

The pipeline would be buried. We do not believe that a buried pipeline would contribute to fire risk or hamper efforts to control a wildfire. Section 4.1.9.2 of the DEIS presents pipeline accident data.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

51

1 tanks containing LNG at the Jordan Cove seem incredibly  
2 volatile and the construction of which I view as a serious  
3 risk not only to emergency responders, but the general  
4 public.

5 I don't believe we have the resources to handle  
6 an explosion that has a potential to create. With the  
7 timber alone, our state is fully involved in fire season.

8 The potential effects LNG could have in an  
9 emergency are to me terrifying. Please consider Oregon  
10 representative are active in creating economic growth that  
11 pose minimal risk to the public, that harvest of O & C  
12 lands, has predicted job growth and money for counties. I  
13 believe Williamson and Erickson are being deceptive. The  
14 majority of the profits will go out of state. The DEIS even  
15 states that only 20 percent of the workforce will be local  
16 in the construction process. This may be what's best for  
17 the corporations, but for Oregon's future and economy I  
18 believe as a whole this pipeline is not consistent with  
19 public interest nor is it sustainable.

20 The purpose and need is not substantiated when  
21 weighed with the risks involved.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

25 Next is George Logan.

PM4-19

**PM4**

**Continued, page 51 of 162**

PM4-19

The Commission would make its finding of public benefit in its decision-document Project Order. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

52

PM4

Continued, page 52 of 162

1 MR. LOGAN: Hello, my name is George Logan,  
2 G-e-o-r-g-e L-o-g-a-n. And I'm representing Iron Workers  
3 Local 29. I'm a disabled Vietnam Vet and I know I don't  
4 look like it, but I am. And I've been, you know, working as  
5 an iron worker for almost 40 years now. I worked on this  
6 project up the hill at Klamath Falls with that power plant  
7 and worked at Intel, ran work over there. These jobs  
8 attract the best talent you can find. That's why I've  
9 worked all over the country. It's an excellent, safe job to  
10 be working on. I've worked on Cojams, I've worked offshore,  
11 I've worked on an offshore gas platform. They set those  
12 things up all over the world but it takes talent to do it.  
13 You can't just run out there and throw those things up. It  
14 brings work to the area. It brings a lot of money to the  
15 area. And so when it's all said and done, everybody is  
16 going to be wealthier for it, not just the construction  
17 company or the gas company, because it's a lot of  
18 maintenance going in to keep this thing up.  
19 So thanks, folks. Thanks for everybody coming  
20 out. I really appreciate it. This is God love America  
21 because you're Americans and everybody's got their time to  
22 speak and it makes me proud. Thank you.  
23 (Applause.)  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
25 Next is Bob Carroll. And after Bob is Stacy



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

53

PM4

Continued, page 53 of 162

PM4-20

Comment noted.

1 McLaughlin, Bobby Scoggin, and John Clarke.  
2 MR. CARROLL: Bob Carroll, C-a-r-r-o-l-l. I'm a  
3 proponent of this project, the pipeline and the end-using  
4 plant. We can -- I'm a 36-year member of the IBEW,  
5 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. We can  
6 build this safely, we can help build it safely and we want  
7 it built safely and to the highest standards. Every dollar  
8 that's spent on this project is going to rebound through  
9 this community several times. It also creates opportunity  
10 for the young folks, the apprenticeships. And there's going  
11 to need to be plenty of them to build these projects.  
12 I urge that the permits and the studies are done.  
13 I urge safety.  
14 Thank you very much and thanks for being here.  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
16 (Applause.)  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Stacey McLaughlin.  
18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Good evening, thank you.  
19 Fifteen years ago my husband and I realized our dream. We  
20 were able to purchase some property and for the first two  
21 years we literally bent over and picked up trash. We took  
22 over 200 appliances to the landfill. We have created new  
23 habitats for the wildlife in our area. We have restored our  
24 property.  
25 We planted over 10,000 trees. And now they want

PM4-20

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

54

1 to put a pipeline through our dream.  
2 Yeah, I am an American, but my property and my  
3 life is at risk. This is not about jobs. It's not about  
4 safe construction. It's about our planet and it's about our  
5 community. It's not about saving one person and sacrificing  
6 another.  
7 This project has done nothing but divide our  
8 communities across southern Oregon. And frankly, it breaks  
9 my heart. It breaks my heart that this is what's happening  
10 in our community all because of foreign, for-profit  
11 corporation wants to benefit their shareholders. All  
12 because William Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline wants to  
13 continue to exploit the private property owner.  
14 I have no desire to have my property subject to a  
15 5,000-page DEIS that does not have any mitigation standards  
16 in it.  
17 When I look at it and it says to me, oh, we're  
18 going to construct the pipeline and then we will assess what  
19 that damage is. That's not what a DEIS is supposed to do.  
20 I have 30 years of background in land-use  
21 planning and government. A DEIS, an EIS, and an FEIS is  
22 supposed to give us some answers. It's supposed to offer us  
23 some alternatives. This document is inadequate, and  
24 insufficient for a certificate of public convenience and  
25 necessity to be issued.

PM4-21

PM4-22

## PM4

## Continued, page 54 of 162

PM4-21

The impacts that the Project would have to resources and lands are disclosed in the EIS. The EIS also contains a description of the required mitigation measures.

PM4-22

The Commission would make its finding of public benefit in its decision-document Project Order. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

55

PM4

Continued, page 55 of 162

1           You say to me that it is not approved. So I have  
2   an administrative question. And that is, this document was  
3   issued and it says that we really don't think there are any  
4   substantial impacts. So what does that tell me? That tells  
5   me that this is minutes away -- minutes away from being  
6   approved. Can you answer that question?

7           MR. FRIEDMAN: The Commission is quite a long way  
8   from making a decision. The FEIS must be published first  
9   and then they'll decide.

10          MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you for that  
11   clarification. I appreciate that.

12          This is breaking my heart. My country is  
13   breaking my heart with what it's doing and allowing with  
14   respect to fracking and the climate change issues. We are  
15   ignoring the science. And as someone before me said earlier  
16   this evening, you have the opportunity. You have the  
17   opportunity to stand up and make a statement. This is your  
18   air too. And it's everybody else's in this room.

19          MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

20          (Applause.)

21          MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is -- is Bobby Scoggin going  
22   to talk?

23          (No response.)

24          MR. FRIEDMAN: No. Okay. Then it's your forum,  
25   John, but wait a second, let me call some other people up.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

56

PM4

Continued, page 56 of 162

1           After John, I would like Ben Mew, John Ashem, and  
2 Robert Grizzar and then Jay Hamlin.  
3           MR. CLARKE: John Clarke, J-o-h-n C-l-a-r-k-e,  
4 milepost 60.  
5           I'm going to just read just a statement that was  
6 out of the draft EIS. I have a couple questions for Paul,  
7 if that's okay. They're generic and because of that comment  
8 you made last night about the utility facility necessary for  
9 public service and --  
10          MR. FRIEDMAN: Why don't I address that right  
11 now? Okay. I think John is talking about eminent domain  
12 after a certificate is issued; is that correct? Is that  
13 your question?  
14          MR. CLARKE: That's where we're starting.  
15          MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, I'll address it right now.  
16 We would prefer if the pipeline company would negotiate in  
17 good faith with all landowners. If, however, they're unable  
18 to reach an agreement, and if the Commission issues a  
19 certificate of public convenience and necessity, the United  
20 States Congress gave the authority of eminent domain to that  
21 certificate. That was done in 1947, Section 7H of the  
22 Natural Gas Act.  
23          MR. CLARKE: That's not quite where I was going.  
24          MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.  
25          MR. CLARKE: Okay. So I'll read the statement.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

57

PM4

Continued, page 57 of 162

1 The Commission would authorize the proposed -- the proposal  
2 unless it finds the proposed facility would not be  
3 consistent with public interest. If I make a statement, I'm  
4 just going to ask you if it's true or not. And the  
5 statement I would make is that if you grant the permit, you  
6 would grant the certificate --

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Commissioners would.

8 MR. CLARKE: The Commission. I'm sorry. Yes,  
9 the Commissioners would. Which would allow then the process  
10 of the eminent domain if necessary.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

12 MR. CLARKE: Okay. So the certificate of  
13 necessity is for the applicant.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

15 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Where we're going with this  
16 is, because of the public, it has to be in the public  
17 interest. If you issued the -- if the Commission issues the  
18 permit, then I have to believe you made the decision that it  
19 met --

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: In the Commission order they will  
21 actually have a discussion of public need and benefit in  
22 writing in narrative that you can read. But I want to get  
23 in so that I could comment on things that would matter. And  
24 so is there anyplace that we can get something that gives  
25 the criteria -- I would imagine safety is something,

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

58

1 environment conditions --  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: You can look at past Commission  
3 order. The Commissioners tend to write orders in similar  
4 manner. And there have been several LNG export facilities  
5 the Commission has already authorized. For example, what's  
6 the most recent? Well, Subine Pass is one example.  
7 Freeport is another example. So you could look at those  
8 past Commission orders and the Commissioners tend to write  
9 orders in a similar manner.  
10 MR. CLARKE: So that we have some idea of what  
11 we're going to gear our comments to. So that's why I needed  
12 to know that. That's all I have.  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
14 Next is Ben Mew.  
15 (Applause.)  
16 MR. MEW: Ben Mew, B-e-n M-e-w. I'd just like to  
17 say that I've read that 90 percent of landowners are saying  
18 no to the pipeline going through their land. And I think  
19 that the eminent domain is unfair. And I think it's  
20 unconstitutional to do something on private land -- private  
21 landowners' land without their consent.  
22 Unless it's in the public interest; right? Is  
23 this in the public interest? I don't think so. We've heard  
24 from many people. Scientists are saying climate change is a  
25 threat to our humanity and the science is irrefutable. I

PM4

Continued, page 58 of 162

PM4-23

The Commission would make its finding of public benefit in its decision-document Project Order. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

PM4-23

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

59

1 think this pipeline is a move in the wrong direction. We  
2 have to stop investing in fossil fuels, and look to a  
3 different kind of future. This we need to change the debate  
4 between the environment versus jobs and we need to find ways  
5 jobs that are good for the environment and good for all of  
6 us. There are plenty of those out there, solar, wind, micro  
7 hydro, local sustainable farming, these are all  
8 opportunities for job growth and I would love to see us all  
9 invest in those kinds of futures. Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

12 Next is John Aschim.

13 MR. ASCHIM: Thank you. John, J-o-h-n,  
14 A-s-c-h-i-m. I'm a member of United Brotherhood of  
15 Carpenters, Local 291. I'm also a landowner here in Douglas  
16 County. I'm trying to get into the clean food movement,  
17 supply good food. I support this project. I do believe  
18 that the state of Oregon is constricted through the Portland  
19 corridor and at much greater risk than anyone is willing to  
20 give any lip service to.

21 Coos Bay is the only other deepwater naturally  
22 occurring port in the state of Oregon. And for the future  
23 of our economy and for the future of Oregon, we need to  
24 build this thing.

25 Thank you.

PM4 Continued, page 59 of 162

PM4-24 Comment noted.

PM4-24

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

60

PM4

Continued, page 60 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
2 (Applause.)  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Robert Granger and please  
4 correct me. I know I've mispronounced your name.  
5 MR. GRANGER: Let's try Robert Granger.  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.  
7 MR. GRANGER: G-r-a-n-g-e-r. If this pipeline is  
8 built, a few people will reap enormous profits, a very few.  
9 And I believe it's really those few who are ultimately  
10 behind the push to make it happen. There certainly would be  
11 some jobs produced along the way, but many of those jobs  
12 would vanish afterwards.  
13 But it is we, the people, who will pay the  
14 long-term price for making those few rich. We will pay the  
15 price in terms of environmental degradation. We will pay  
16 the price of living day after day with the fear of possible  
17 explosion. And if such an explosion happens, as it has many  
18 times before, it's not those who reap enormous profits who  
19 will pay the bill. For them, any cost that they may be  
20 forced to endure will be passed off as CDB, the cost of  
21 doing business. It's the rest of us who will pay the real  
22 price. Who will pay it in cleaning up a mess that we didn't  
23 make. We'll pay it in the lives of sisters and brothers  
24 whose lives are left in shambles, and all too possibly in  
25 lives lost. And all of this just to put some gas on ships,



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

61

PM4

Continued, page 61 of 162

1 not for our benefit, but to send out to sea.  
2 Now, I think before it begins, is a time to stop  
3 this madness. The price of making a few people wealthy is a  
4 price that we, the people do not deserve to be saddled with.  
5 Thank you.  
6 (Applause.)  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
8 I'm going to call up a bunch of people. I've got  
9 Jay Hamlin, and then behind you I would like Perry Murray,  
10 Alex Campbell, and John Williams, and Sue Craig.  
11 MR. HAMLIN: I'm Jay Hamlin, J-a-y H-a-m-l-i-n.  
12 I am an operating engineer. I work for the 701. I am a  
13 representative for the area. I want to speak to the  
14 opposition. I've worked closely with FERC with BLM and U.S.  
15 Forest Service for many years being an operator. They have  
16 very strict standards of quality and environmental -- you  
17 know, environmental impacts for our future. Without their  
18 -- you know, without their -- without it they would just let  
19 people run amok out in the woods. I've seen it with my own  
20 eyes. And without control from agencies they form just  
21 standards. And I have worked on the -- in Coos Bay in  
22 2000-2001, I worked for a local company. Work was very  
23 profitable. There's lots of work in Coos Bay, the south  
24 coast.  
25 I moved away from there back to Eugene for family

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

62

PM4

Continued, page 62 of 162

1 reasons. But I have recently been back there. It's hard  
2 for me to see the local companies struggling to keep their  
3 workers at work and they have to outsource their work to  
4 Eugene to Portland to Washington, California, and this --  
5 you know, with this project, it's not just the peak of the  
6 project, it brings a bunch of work in to build the facility,  
7 but afterwards the money going to the schools, maintaining  
8 roads for Coos Bay and the counties associated with the  
9 pipeline, it will put people to work there. It's kind of a  
10 ripple effect for everybody.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Perry Murray.

15 MR. MURRAY: Perry Murray. P-e-r-r-y  
16 M-u-r-r-a-y. I'm here presenting the Douglas County  
17 Industrial Development Board to talk a little bit about the  
18 local public need.

19 So Douglas County has an industrial-based  
20 economy. There's no teaching hospital, no Air Force base,  
21 no four-year college, or university, no large government  
22 offices, and probably no support, and no passenger air  
23 service. And we're not likely to see any of these things,  
24 not only short-term, but probably not long-term.

25 So, our unemployment rate hit 18 percent a few

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

63

PM4

Continued, page 63 of 162

1 years ago and is currently 9.6 percent, which is several  
2 points higher than the balance of the state and  
3 significantly higher than the nation.

4 So I currently serve on the industrial  
5 development board and as past president -- I'm past  
6 president of the Partnership for Economic Development and  
7 current president of the Umpqua Business Development Board.  
8 So I have a good understanding of the effort the community  
9 has been putting forth to try and diversify our economy.

10 Through my role serving on the county industrial  
11 development board, I've had the opportunity to meet with  
12 industrial manufacturers, site selectors, and show them  
13 properties locally that might fit their needs. Site  
14 selectors always have a number of criteria they use in  
15 decisionmaking, labor, land, transportation, fresh water,  
16 waste water, power, and natural gas. The county has four  
17 industrial sites along the I-5 corridor that parallel the  
18 current gas line. These sites are, for the most part,  
19 developed with adequate utilities with the exception of  
20 natural gas, adequate to supply a high-volume user.

21 We are on the tail end of a very long pipeline  
22 and beginning near Cottage Grove, a city to the north about  
23 50 miles. The line is reduced to a ten-inch gas line. This  
24 is not a gas pipe, but this represents the size of the pipe  
25 that travels through Douglas County and down at Jackson

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

64

PM4

Continued, page 64 of 162

1 County where the pipeline ends.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is that the Grants Pass?

3 MR. MURRAY: That's Grants Pass lateral. There

4 are more than 30,000 subscribers on this gas line. It is

5 fully subscribed. And being only supplied from the north

6 and ending, for all practical use, in the city of Grants

7 Pass to the south, the system leaves us with an

8 interruptible gas supply as opposed to an uninterruptible

9 gas supply, a requirement that most industrial users need.

10 So the Pacific Connector will provide Douglas

11 County with a second source and an increased supply of

12 natural gas should the connection point to our existing

13 natural gas transmission line at Round Perry, about ten

14 miles south of the city. The County Industrial Board sees

15 this proposed development as a solution to our current

16 over-subscribed gas line, provide the community with a

17 necessary energy source that will enhance our opportunity to

18 attract --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: And, Perry, can you wrap up now?

20 MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Our next speaker is

24 Alex Campbell.

25 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Alex Campbell,

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

65

PM4

Continued, page 65 of 162

1 C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l. I'm the Director of the Partnership for  
2 Economic Development here in Douglas County. In addition to  
3 the points Mr. Murray made, I would like to talk about the  
4 contribution I see in the long term to economic stability in  
5 the area.

6 I think the FEIS or the DEIS did a good job of  
7 noting the property tax increase. That will be a 35 percent  
8 increase in property tax receipts for Douglas County which  
9 is critical to preserving local services. I think one of  
10 the things that may not be appropriate to the scope of the  
11 DEIS, but from my standpoint thinking about economic  
12 development, the contribution of this infrastructure to the  
13 health of the port at Coos Bay is very significant.

14 When I think about the next 50 years of the  
15 economy in southwest Oregon, the continued development of  
16 infrastructure at the port of Coos Bay is absolutely  
17 critical to the health of our community.

18 When I look at the connection between the highway  
19 to the coast and I-5, it's here in Douglas County, we are  
20 all interrelated economically here in southwest Oregon. And  
21 to the extent that the port of Coos Bay continues to be a  
22 healthy and a critical piece of that economy, it is to our  
23 benefit here in Douglas County.

24 I see benefit to the existing shippers,  
25 specifically RFP from some of the spillovers from the

PM4-25

PM4-25

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

66

PM4

Continued, page 66 of 162

1 project. The port of Coos Bay being in a good situation  
2 allows them to continue their efforts to expand and approve  
3 the Coos Bay rail link which is critical to serving both  
4 industrial sites on Bolan Island and in Gardner, the form  
5 International Paper site. And it also will encourage and  
6 make possible future new expansions of the port.

7 I mean, the port, as you may be aware, has a  
8 long-term plan to add a cargo facility, a container cargo  
9 facility that would be greatly -- that prospects for would  
10 be greatly enhanced by the channel deepening and other  
11 aspects of this project. So, I think while I respect and  
12 understand the comment -- many of the comments here tonight,  
13 I believe that clearly eminent domain is enabled through a  
14 public process for projects with a public purpose. And I  
15 think there are very strong positive effects to the impacted  
16 community here in Douglas County.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is John Williams and then  
21 Susan Craig.

22 MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. My name is John  
23 Paul Williams, J-o-h-n, P-a-u-l, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s. Excuse  
24 me. For the last 30 years I've been an environmental  
25 researcher with my own company, Williams Research. Looked

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

67

1 at hundreds of large, industrial project throughout the  
2 United States. Looked at dozens and dozens of permits and  
3 environmental impact reviews.

4 I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of Operating  
5 Engineers Local 701, men and women living in Oregon, some of  
6 them living in this community, that operate generally heavy  
7 equipment at construction sites such as cranes and  
8 bulldozers.

9 You heard a lot of people say that they haven't  
10 read the whole EIS. And that's a problem because you end up  
11 with misconceptions. One of the few things they've read is  
12 the executive summary and that's as good as far as it goes,  
13 but there's benefits from this project including mitigation  
14 proposals that people are never going to see unless they get  
15 1,000 pages into that draft EIS. And these are things that  
16 should have been mentioned in the executive summary.

17 One of the worst things that I've told for the  
18 health of a forest is an unmaintained road. It's compacted,  
19 the soil is useless, there's erosion, as part of this  
20 project 98 and a half miles of roads will be decommissioned.  
21 Eighteen miles of roads will be closed. That's 120 miles of  
22 improvement in the public lands. The pipeline only runs on  
23 those public lands for 70 miles. Fourteen culverts will be  
24 removed a fish passage, 620 acres of habitat will be  
25 developed for sensitive species. Placement of woody debris

PM4-26

PM4-27

**PM4**

**Continued, page 67 of 162**

PM4-26

Due to the complexity of the Project, details regarding every aspect of the Project as well as its impacts cannot be included in the Executive Summary. The mitigation measures are meant to mitigate for adverse effects of the Project, and would not be considered as "beneficial effects" beyond the scope of offsetting adverse effects.

PM4-27

The plans that contain these measures are discussed in the "Major Conclusions" portion of the Executive Summary. Furthermore, these measures are also described throughout the EIS. The measures that are required by the BLM and Forest Service (which include most of the measures listed in your comment) are also discussed in detail within appendix F.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

68

PM4

Continued, page 68 of 162

1 and snags in creeks can prove habitats for a variety of  
2 critters will take place on 1500 acres; 1,8976 acres of  
3 forest will be managed more carefully for the spotted owl  
4 habitat.  
5 There's going to be 309 additional acres for  
6 wetland mitigation. All of these benefits are nearly  
7 impossible to find in the EIS, they should have been in the  
8 executive summary in a chart or a graph that linked together  
9 the impacts from the projects with the solutions and let  
10 folks see and perhaps judge better the benefits and  
11 betterments from this project.  
12 Thank you.  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
14 (Applause.)  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: After Sue Craig, I'd like Bob  
16 Barker, Jim Dahlman, Gregory Flick, and Deborah McGee and  
17 Patty Hine to line up.  
18 MS. CRAIG: Sue Craig, S-u-e, C-r-a-i-g. The  
19 idea that you can produce this kind of gas and send it to  
20 where you want to send it and not have problems and not say  
21 that is an environmental problem, with what we know now  
22 about climate change, is just ridiculous. It's just the  
23 whole idea is bizarre.  
24 Yes, we need jobs. We absolutely need jobs, but  
25 we need them in the area of producing clean -- clean produce

PM4-27  
confd



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

69

1 for us in every area. And I hope you can think about that.  
2 This whole project is an environmental disaster from  
3 beginning to end.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. BARKER: Hi, Bob Barker, that's B-o-b  
8 B-a-r-k-e-r, just like the Price Is Right. And I can be  
9 found around mile post 122.6.

10 So, Paul, you know, when the FERC issues a  
11 certificate with that goes the presumption that the project  
12 is in the public interest and thereby the power of eminent  
13 domain is granted. What's not clear to me is what  
14 constitutes the public interest?

15 Certainly as a landowner, a foreign country  
16 shipping foreign gas to another foreign country to make a  
17 lot of money does not appear to me to be in the public  
18 interest. I would really appreciate it if either in the  
19 final EIS or in the Commission order that they would provide  
20 an explicit explanation of the public interest as it relates  
21 to this project. This is not about energy security for gas  
22 coming through the United States. This is about the export  
23 of gas to other countries.

24 Secondly, I would certainly respectfully request  
25 that the comment period for this project be extended from 90

PM4-28

PM4-29

**PM4**

**Continued, page 69 of 162**

PM4-28

The Commission would make its finding of public benefit in its decision-document Project Order. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

PM4-29

The FERC decided not to extend the 90-day period for comments on the DEIS past February 13, 2015.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

70

PM4

Continued, page 70 of 162

1 to 120 days. It comes over the holidays and as everybody  
2 has described, this is an extremely long and complex project  
3 and it would be very much appreciated if that extension  
4 would be granted.

PM4-29  
cont'd

5 The final thing is a minor item, but as a  
6 landowner working with other landowners, we've had a hard  
7 time getting a list of affected landowners. And I don't  
8 know if you can respond to this now, but will you make  
9 available to us a list of all the affected landowners and  
10 their addresses along the pipeline route?

PM4-30

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Two questions that you asked and  
12 I'll answer both of them. The Commission order typically  
13 has a description of what the Commissioners believe to be  
14 the public benefits of the public project.

15 The second question is, the Commission typically  
16 does not allow addresses of landowners to be made public.  
17 But I believe there is a list at the back of the DEIS of  
18 everyone who received the DEIS without addresses, and that  
19 includes all landowners.

20 MR. BARKER: Okay. I guess the reason I asked  
21 the question is, on the import side dating back to 2007, I  
22 have a list of all the landowners at that time. And I have  
23 not seen such a document this time around. So that's where  
24 the question comes from.

25 Okay. That's all I have.

PM4-30

FERC does not normally release this information.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

71

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Jim Dahlman.  
3 MR. DAHLMAN: Yeah, my name is James Dahlman,  
4 D-a-h-l-m-a-n, Rice Creek Road, Winston, Oregon.  
5 First, I'd like to say thank you for the  
6 opportunity to express my opinions tonight. Right off I'd  
7 like to say that I am pro jobs for Oregon. I'm pro union.  
8 I'm a retired union member. But my major complaint with  
9 this pipeline project is the eminent domain issue. That is  
10 the taking of private property for the financial gain of a  
11 Canadian company by selling gas to Asia. And I just cannot  
12 understand where the public interest is for Oregon in that  
13 description.  
14 Next, I'd like to say, does anyone remember -- in  
15 this room -- this date, September the 9th, 2010, place, San  
16 Bruno, California? There was a massive PG&E pipeline  
17 explosion killing eight people. There was a 1,000-foot wall  
18 of flame. I remember that because I was there. They say it  
19 could happen. Well, I'm here to tell you that it can.  
20 And last I would like to say I would like to  
21 challenge anyone here tonight to tell me that they would  
22 love to have a 36 diameter, super high-pressure, 1400 PSA  
23 pipeline right outside their house 24/7.  
24 Thank you.  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

PM4-31

**PM4**

**Continued, page 71 of 162**

PM4-31

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

72

PM4

Continued, page 72 of 162

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Gregory Flick.  
3 MR. FLICK: My name is Gregory Flick, F-l-i-c-k.  
4 I'm a retired journeyman, wireman, union electrician. And  
5 I'm here to oppose that LNG project the Jordan Cove project  
6 and the Pacific Connector pipeline which are kind of  
7 disguised under a Canadian energy company called Veresen.  
8 Now, from what I understand, Veresen owns the gas in the  
9 pipeline, they own the pipeline, they're going to own the  
10 LNG terminal, and they're going to send Canadian gas off our  
11 shore to Asian markets and we're not going to get one red  
12 cent of it. What's the matter with this picture?  
13 Another thing I'm looking at is the Federal  
14 Energy Regulatory Commission, I went to your website and I  
15 looked through it and I saw how well the Commissioner are  
16 appointed by the president and past presidents and whatnot.  
17 And I also discovered that the Federal Energy Regulatory  
18 Commission is funded by the industry that they regulate.  
19 (Applause.)  
20 MR. FLICK: Now, what's with that? Am I right or  
21 am I wrong?  
22 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.  
23 (Laughter.)  
24 MR. FLICK: So who's tending the chicken house  
25 here?

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

73

PM4

Continued, page 73 of 162

1 (Laughter.)  
2 MR. FLICK: You know, there's a lot -- I'm a  
3 pro-union member and I'm also a pro-growth member and I know  
4 that there's a lot of industries that are just wanting to  
5 come here into Coos Bay and develop wind turbines that they  
6 can send offshore and boy you can make a lot of wind  
7 turbines with all of that pipeline, all that material.  
8 There's a lot of IBEW guys that are going to wind those  
9 motors. There's going to be a lot of iron workers putting  
10 up those towers and making and fabricating and things like  
11 that. And, you know, Veresen is not the first Canadian  
12 company to come in here to Oregon and give all these big  
13 grandeur ideas about how they're going to create jobs and  
14 it's going to be good for the economy. We're living with a  
15 Formosa mind up here in Riddle, Oregon, where a Canadian  
16 company came in and dug copper ore and after two years they  
17 left. And they left us with a superfund site and they  
18 aren't going to do a doggone thing about it and all that  
19 strychnine and all that stuff is washing down into our  
20 creek, killing our fish, killing -- and poisoning wells.  
21 You know, this thing stinks. And on top of that  
22 your gases you're going to put in the pipeline is  
23 unodorized, (sic) so if there is a leak no one is going to  
24 be able to smell it until the thing goes sky high.  
25 And who would put an LNG plant at the end of a

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

74

PM4

Continued, page 74 of 162

1 runway?

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. FLICK: I crab over here, you know. I know  
4 where this stuff is. I fish in the bay. And this thing  
5 stinks.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

8 Deborah McGee?

9 MS. MCGEE: My last name is M-c capital G-e-e.

10 I'm a semi-retired public school educator, mental  
11 health professional, and an organic subsistence farmer.  
12 I've lived on five acres in the country outside Eugene for  
13 30 years. This day it is not my land you are planning to  
14 allow foreign corporate profiteers to take and put a  
15 pipeline across, but tomorrow or the next day it could be my  
16 land.

17 The sacred ashes of my family are on my land.  
18 How could I live? How could my grandchildren play in safety  
19 with a three-and-a-half-foot pressurized fossil fuel pipe  
20 beneath their feet? A pipe that will have lowered safety  
21 and quality standards of materials and inspections because  
22 rural, less-densely populated areas allow the corporation to  
23 employ fewer safety precautions. Why? Because fewer people  
24 possibly being hurt or killed in an accident is more  
25 acceptable than more people? Not if they're the people you

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

75

PM4

Continued, page 75 of 162

1 love.

2 How would any of you sitting there tonight feel  
3 about deciding to put this pipeline below your home or your  
4 yard where your children play? These pipes do leak.  
5 Sometimes explode. Not all the time, but some of the time.  
6 I've seen the pictures.

7 Because it's legal for this corporation to do  
8 this, does not make it right or just. We all know we must  
9 stop burning fossil fuels soon if we are to get the carbon  
10 back to a livable planet at 300 parts per million as 97  
11 percent of the world's scientists say we must to keep a  
12 habitable planet for people.

13 We passed 400 parts in May. The ice sheets are  
14 melting, we cannot stop that now.

15 Is it not in the scope of your report and  
16 recommendations to be concerned about the future of a  
17 livable planet?

18 You write reports that give permits that allow  
19 harm to life, water and air. Is this about jobs? Well, I  
20 guess the Nazi concentration camps created jobs. What kind  
21 of jobs are good but damage others? The children and  
22 grandchildren of these workers here tonight will suffer the  
23 consequences of this decision if this project is allowed.

24 We are one earth, one atmosphere. The harms to  
25 any are harms to us all. Look at indigenous wisdom, Chief

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

76

PM4

Continued, page 76 of 162

1 Joseph said, "What we do to the earth, we do to ourselves."  
2 I implore you to do the right thing and stop this project.  
3 I beg you to care enough for the rest of us to just say no.  
4 We have to stop. We are going to extinct our species by  
5 destroying our habitat. Currently 200 species every day are  
6 going extinct. If you allow this project you are adding  
7 nails in our children's' coffins. Please be bold. Do the  
8 right thing. Say no.  
9 (Applause.)  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
11 Our next speaker is Patty Hine and and after  
12 Patty is Dean Mariah, Jerry Smith and Elliott Grey.  
13 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.) That chair has  
14 been absent for a long time. I thought you guys were  
15 supposed to be listening?  
16 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.)  
17 PARTICIPANT: He has been gone from that chair  
18 for at least 15 minutes.  
19 PARTICIPANT: He's out in the hall.  
20 PARTICIPANT: Well, go get him.  
21 (Applause.)  
22 MS. LIBERATORE: I will address that for you.  
23 I'm representing the Forest Service and the BLM tonight.  
24 And there are other representatives of the agency here, but  
25 I'm the project manager and I'm the one that needs to hear



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

77

1 the comments.  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Patty?  
3 MS. HINE: Patty Hine, P-a-t-t-y H-i-n-e.  
4 Thank you for this opportunity to comment in the  
5 DEIS regarding the Pacific Connector pipeline and the Jordon  
6 Cove projects.  
7 It's my understanding that the DEIS has found  
8 that there will be no negative environmental impact so long  
9 as the mitigation is properly carried out.  
10 I simply do not believe this. I know it's a  
11 complicated project, big business, and it's very  
12 bureaucratic in the process. I can see.  
13 I was in the Navy for 20 year and I understand  
14 bureaucracy. And since retiring from the U.S. Navy and  
15 taking my place as a citizen in my community, I have become  
16 increasingly concerned about how little voice the people in  
17 this country's communities have compared against the  
18 powerful interests of corporations, especially big energy  
19 companies. And the lack of support for the public's  
20 interests. It seems there is no end to the extracting,  
21 delivering and burning of fossil fuels for profit that are  
22 warming our planet beyond the point that it can sustain  
23 life.  
24 Now, as our public agencies, it seems to me that  
25 we can expect you to take the facts, the facts that science

PM4-32

**PM4**

**Continued, page 77 of 162**

PM4-32

The DEIS does not state that there would be “no negative environmental impacts.” Negative impacts were noted in respective sections. Mitigation includes avoidance, minimization, and, where these cannot occur, mitigation to supplement remaining impacts.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

78

PM4

Continued, page 78 of 162

1 has provided, and make decisions based on those. I was  
2 expected as an operational commander to take into account  
3 all the facts.  
4 We know we have to reduce greenhouse gases --  
5 it's that simple -- to maintain or gain a stable climate.  
6 This means we have to turn away from building out  
7 infrastructure designed to extract, deliver and burn fossil  
8 fuels. It's just that simple.  
9 We need to massively reforest. We need clean  
10 energy, we need it now. Why are we bending over backward to  
11 approve this for the jobs that are not part of the new green  
12 economy; for the profits of a foreign company against the  
13 wishes of communities? This my friends is not democracy.  
14 I for one believe we must face facts, abandon all  
15 destructive projects now, like the Pacific Connector  
16 pipeline and Jordan Cove terminal projects and turn our  
17 brave American ingenuity to transitioning alternate energy  
18 and building this new clean economy. We can do it. Say no  
19 to this project.  
20 Thank you.  
21 (Applause.)  
22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
23 The next speaker is Dee Mariah.  
24 MS. MARIAH: My name is actually Mariah.  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting me.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

79

PM4

Continued, page 79 of 162

1 MS. MARIAH: That's all right. You might be  
2 surprised to know, a lot of people do that.  
3 My name is Mariah. I'm a resident of Eugene.  
4 But I'm also a member of the Oregon Women's Land Trust that  
5 among other things manages owl farm, which is in the path of  
6 the LNG pipeline, in the middle of Days Creek. This land  
7 was purchased in 1976 as a sanctuary for women and safe  
8 habitat for the many plants, animals, fish and fowl native  
9 to this area as a natural conservatory into perpetuity.  
10 Next year we will have been such -- we have been  
11 successful at this for 40 years. What we can't figure out  
12 here is how anyone would dare to offer up this land to a  
13 foreign country as an imminent domain to run liquid gas, a  
14 dangerous product, to another foreign country. In what way  
15 does this dangerous substance which will at least put at  
16 risk and probably destroy all natural people living here  
17 including possibly our residents and our offspring. Yes.  
18 I'm a mother, a grandmother, and proud great-grandparent of  
19 four. I care about what happens after I'm gone.  
20 What I don't understand is why some people don't.  
21 We put money ahead of everything. Something I don't expect  
22 of my government.  
23 I don't understand eminent domain very well. But  
24 I came up with a metaphor of sorts, and I would like you to  
25 imagine if someone came to you, the government, the people

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

80

PM4

Continued, page 80 of 162

1 in charge, came up to you and grabbed one of your children  
2 and said, for the good of the country I'm going to need to  
3 take your child. Lay them down on the ground then run over  
4 them. That's what this proposal amounts to. I don't have  
5 to ask you to vote no, do I?  
6 (Applause.)  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
8 Next is Jerry Smith, then Elliott Grey.  
9 MR. SMITH: I'm Jerry Smith. I see the climate  
10 crisis increasing every day. Climate change is leading to  
11 mass extinction of life in our oceans, our forests, and our  
12 farmlands. It doesn't leave us out either. The rest of the  
13 west coast, major ports, have already denied this kind of  
14 fossil fuel dangerous export. And I can see no reason why  
15 they can sneak it in on an impoverished, small Oregon town.  
16 Big, short-term profits will go to international  
17 corporations which have already undermined America's  
18 economy, they take away America's jobs, and avoid paying  
19 America's taxes in a way that's fair, so we already carry  
20 them quite a bit. Long-term coastal jobs providing energy  
21 should be in wind and tidal power. South-facing homes and  
22 mountains should provide solar power.  
23 LNG is extremely dangerous fuel and like coal and  
24 oil, when burned in Asia, will come back to us in extreme  
25 storms. It will further push the nuclear waste and wreckage

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

81

PM4

Continued, page 81 of 162

1 from Japan onto our shores more than now.

2 Burning the remaining sequestered fossil fuels

3 left underground will lead to a period of global

4 bio-extinction and it's self-destructive to have a project

5 like this. It will greatly increase the climate-caused

6 extinctions that are now underway.

7 The plan pipes cross much of publicly protected,

8 common land that belongs to all of us and was saved for our

9 benefit. Exploitive international corporations have no

10 business taking it away for risky damaging profits. It will

11 be --

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Jerry, your time is up.

13 MR. SMITH: -- to me, my family and my country.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Elliott and after Elliott

17 I would like to have the following people line up behind

18 Elliott. Mark Robinowitz, Alec Palm, Ed Finkley, and

19 Clinton Smith.

20 MR. GREY: Elliott Grey, E-l-l-i-o-t-t G-r-e-y.

21 I come from a family of union members. My father was a

22 steam and pipefitter for more than 50 years. And during the

23 '30s, '40s, and '50s he built pipeline and that pipeline was

24 taken by eminent domain. But that eminent domain served the

25 public good. It built the energy infrastructure in this

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

82

PM4

Continued, page 82 of 162

1 country.

2 This pipeline is going to be for the good of a  
3 foreign company. I urge you not to make your decision  
4 regarding the citing of the Jordan Cove pipeline and the LNG  
5 plant within a vacuum. You must make your decisions within  
6 the context of what's going on in the world, not just what's  
7 taking place along the pipeline or in the port of Coos Bay.

8 While jobs and profits are important factors in  
9 making your decision, you must measure it against the  
10 greater impacts. Given the recent IPCC report, as mentioned  
11 in the New York Times that other people have mentioned of  
12 November 31st -- November 30th, 2014, we can no longer  
13 expect to maintain temperature changes below the two degree  
14 Celsius level that we hoped to. Given our current CO2 and  
15 methane emissions trends, we are more likely headed to a  
16 four to ten degrees.

17 Given the landmark announcement of President  
18 Obama and President Jin Ping of China, committing the two  
19 worlds' largest carbon polluters to cutting their emissions  
20 by 2015, we can no longer continue to expand our capacities  
21 in fuel extraction and consumption. If we continue to build  
22 capacity, how are we going to meet the United States' goal  
23 to cut emissions by 28 percent by 2025?

24 Our carbon consumption budget is coming to an  
25 end. It's inaccurate to say that the negative environmental

PM4-33

PM4-33

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

83

1 factors can be mitigated given our limited CO2 and methane  
2 budgets, given the timeframes we're dealing with. The  
3 studies binding the impact of this project can be mitigated  
4 are either naive or misinformed given the increases and  
5 omissions and the rate of temperature rise.  
6 The Jordan Cove LNG plant will be the second  
7 largest emitter in the state, the largest, the Boardman Coal  
8 burning plant is being phased out due to its impacts on the  
9 environment. This will make Jordan Cove the largest  
10 emitter.  
11 This spring 13 energy agencies concluded that  
12 climate change would harm the economy of the United States,  
13 increasing food prices, insurance rates, and financial  
14 volatility. Is your report taking these projections into  
15 account?  
16 And speaking of mitigations, how can we mitigate  
17 the loss of 926 acres of marbled murrelet habitat when the  
18 state of Oregon is planning on allowing clear cut logging in  
19 the Elliott state forest, prime marbled murrelet habitat.  
20 Thank you.  
21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
22 (Applause.)  
23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mark?  
24 MR. ROBINOWITZ: Mark Robinowitz,  
25 R-o-b-i-n-o-w-i-t-z. I have studied energy concerns for

PM4-33,  
continued

PM4-34

PM4-35

## PM4

## Continued, page 83 of 162

PM4-34

Section 4.14.3.12 addresses the general importance of climate change. As discussed in section 4.12.1.4, the overall impact on global GHG emissions is speculative.

PM4-35

Federally listed species are managed by the FWS. Surveys and avoidance, minimization and mitigation requirements will be identified in the BO prepared by the FWS following the release of the FEIS. Marbled murrelets are discussed in section 4.7.1.2.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

84

1 over 30 years. I've used solar power at my house for over  
2 20 and wind for a decade and a half.

3 An LNG ship has the energy potential of a small  
4 nuclear weapon if it blows up. The temperature inside is  
5 roughly the same as the temperature of the planet Saturn.  
6 And the site for the port would be unsuitable for housing or  
7 a school because of the earthquake and tsunami hazard  
8 dropping 20 feet in an earthquake as happened in January  
9 1700 is not a good thing.

10 I would bet a cord of firewood that this will  
11 flip back to an import terminal. It's not an export  
12 terminal. It's an import terminal. The new terminal that  
13 was built in Baja, California on the Mexican side was an  
14 import terminal. It's been open a couple of years. It's  
15 running some of the California electric grid. Fracking is  
16 bad, but it's also peaking. Most of the fracked areas for  
17 natural gas in the United States are past peak. Some on a  
18 plateau, some in sharp decline. And NEPA, which this is  
19 what this is all about, requires that when there are new  
20 circumstances in a project, you need to do a supplemental  
21 EIS. And if the decline of conventional natural gas, which  
22 has been underway for a decade, and fracking peaking is not  
23 a new circumstance, then there is no such thing as a new  
24 circumstance. The claim that we have so much natural gas we  
25 can export it is just as true as the claim that nuclear

PM4-36

## PM4

## Continued, page 84 of 162

PM4-36

The demand for LNG and the supply of natural gas have fluctuated with economic cycles and technology in the past and will likely continue to do so. Conditions since the DEIS was published have not changed in the extent that an SDEIS is warranted.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

85

PM4

Continued, page 85 of 162

1 power would be too cheap to meter.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. ROBINOWITZ: And we need a holistic  
4 integration. Climate change is part of the problem, but so  
5 is depletion. And unfortunately depletion denial is much  
6 more politically correct than climate change denial.  
7 Everybody has depletion denial.

8 The electric system was never designed to handle  
9 running on natural gas. It's great for heating homes, and  
10 we make fertilizer out of it for conventional fertilizer,  
11 but the increase to running a huge section of the power grid  
12 on natural gas is what's caused the crisis with the gas  
13 system. Fracking has kept it up, but fracking is peaking  
14 and as it declines we'll be left with a toxic legacy.

15 Solar and wind are great. But solar is much less  
16 than 1 percent and wind is now slightly over 1 percent, but  
17 the real issue is going to be preparing for power down and  
18 relocating things. The 400 megawatt power station as part  
19 of this is of equal importance to stop so that we have an  
20 energy system that's based on what's physically possible.  
21 Natural gas cannot be a bridge to a future because there is  
22 not enough natural gas to do that. We need to think about  
23 what's left.

24 And then the final comment, if this is built, the  
25 company needs to post a liability bond to cover the damage

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 to Coos Bay and North Bend if there's an explosion and to  
2 cover the impacts to property owners and nearby property  
3 owners along the route if there's an accident so that  
4 they're not left holding the bag as the money goes away.  
5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
6 (Applause.)  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Alex Palm.  
8 MR. PALM: Hello, my name is Alex Palm, A-l-e-x,  
9 P-a-l-m. I am the current board chair for the Roseburg Area  
10 Chamber of Commerce. The Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce  
11 strongly supports the Jordan Cove LNG project as the success  
12 of this project will be a catalyst for economic development  
13 in our entire region.  
14 The pipeline will offer a unique economic  
15 development recruitment tool for Douglas County. Under  
16 FERC's open access rules, industrial users and utilities  
17 that want to connect to the pipeline can do so. This means  
18 industries that might not otherwise have considered Douglas  
19 County may do so because they will now have access to a  
20 large interstate gas pipeline with available capacity.  
21 In addition, the pipeline will intersect with the  
22 existing Williams Grants Pass lateral pipeline providing the  
23 ability to backflow gas north into Roseburg increasing  
24 available energy supplies. This project will give Roseburg  
25 and Douglas County a reliable and affordable supply of

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

87

PM4

Continued, page 87 of 162

1 energy in addition to our great rail access and I-5 frontage  
2 to attract businesses in the future.

3 Another key point is that once this project is  
4 completed and the line is operational, Douglas County,  
5 alone, will receive approximately \$3 million each and every  
6 year in tax revenue from the pipeline. Keep in mind that  
7 Douglas County only collects a little over \$8 million a year  
8 in property taxes. This \$3 million a year will be able to  
9 backflow lost money from timber receipts and will be a  
10 decades long funding stream that can be counted upon.

11 Think of what \$3 million each and every year  
12 would mean for Douglas County's ability to fund public  
13 safety and other necessities.

14 And for our friends in Reedsport, and Douglas  
15 County brethren, which is only 20 miles north of the  
16 terminal this will greatly -- they will greatly benefit from  
17 the project's community enhancement program. This will  
18 boost funding for schools and other public services in a  
19 community that we all know is really struggling  
20 economically. Reedsport will also receive a huge shot in  
21 the arm during the terminal's construction as some of the  
22 workers will no doubt live and recreate in the Reedsport  
23 area taking advantage of the area's numerous recreational  
24 activities.

25 What's good for Reedsport and good for Coos Bay

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

88

PM4

Continued, page 88 of 162

1 is good for us here in Roseburg.  
2 In closing, the Roseburg area Chamber of Commerce  
3 passionately supports this proposal and urges approval of  
4 the project. Thank you.  
5 (Applause.)  
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
7 The next speaker is Ed Finklea.  
8 MR. FINKLEA: Yes, sir, my name is Ed Finklea, F  
9 as in Frank i-n-k-l-e-a. I am the executive director of the  
10 Northwest Industrial Gas Users. Our organization consists  
11 of 39 companies that use natural gas in their businesses. I  
12 am here to speak in support of the certification of the  
13 Pacific Connector pipeline. Our organization, however, does  
14 not take a position on whether the Jordon Cove export  
15 facility should be certificated. We neither support or  
16 oppose the exporting of LNG from Jordon Cove. However,  
17 there are aspect of the Pacific Connector pipeline that we  
18 urge FERC to consider in its final environmental impact  
19 statement. There are incidental benefits of the  
20 construction of the Pacific Connector pipeline that should  
21 factor into FERC's consideration of this project.  
22 Western Oregon as has been mentioned is currently  
23 only served by a single interstate pipeline, Williams  
24 Pipeline, Northwest Pipeline that runs in Oregon from the  
25 Portland area through the Willamette Valley and down here to

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

89

PM4

Continued, page 89 of 162

1 southern Oregon. In southern Oregon it is referred to as  
2 the Grants Pass Lateral. That pipeline has served Southern  
3 Oregon since the 1950s and I will note that it has done so  
4 safely for well over 50 years.

5 The pipeline, however, is the only way to move  
6 gas into communities such as Roseburg and Grants Pass and  
7 the line is fully subscribed. On cold days, the capacity of  
8 the line is completely maxed out.

9 The Pacific Connector offers two benefits to this  
10 region that are not noted in the draft environment impact  
11 statement. First, the new pipeline would offer a way to  
12 keep gas service flowing into southern Oregon in the event  
13 that there was a delivery interruption on the Williams line  
14 and our organization is urging the Pacific Connector  
15 shippers to provide a way to have gas come off the Pacific  
16 Connector onto the Grants Pass Lateral in the event of an  
17 emergency that would otherwise lead to the shutdown of gas  
18 service in this region. Such an arrangement could be be  
19 provided through what is known as the Northwest Mutual  
20 Assistance Agreement and we would urge the Pacific Connector  
21 shippers to join that agreement and provide an emergency way  
22 to get gas on the Grants Pass Lateral in the event of an  
23 emergency on the Williams line.

24 And second, my organization is aware that the  
25 Pacific Connector would enable Williams to increase gas

PM4-37

PM4-38

PM4-37

Comment noted.

PM4-38

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

90

1 service on the grants pass lateral, Northwest Natural did a  
2 study on this and what it found is that this is a very cost  
3 effective way to provide new service to communities such as  
4 Roseburg, Eugene, Albany, and Salem.

5 And let me be clear, these secondary benefits are  
6 not a reason to certificate Pacific Connector in and of  
7 itself. That decision rests with FERC on the whole question  
8 of the export terminal. However, these are secondary  
9 benefits of the project that should go into the cost benefit  
10 analysis that FERC conducts on the EIS.

11 And then just on the point of climate. Climate  
12 is a world issue, it is not a local issue. Natural gas is a  
13 climate solution. It is not the climate problem. If Asia  
14 doesn't get off of coal and oil --

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's time for you to close.

16 MR. FINKLEA: -- Asia needs to get off of coal  
17 and oil and gas is part of the answer.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Our next speaker is Clifton Smith  
20 and after Clifton is Clarence Adams, Gary Landers, and Julie  
21 Oatfield.

22 MR. SMITH: My name is Clifton Smith.  
23 C-l-i-f-t-o-n, S-m-i-t-h. I'm a member of Operating  
24 Engineers Local 71. I've worked on gas pipelines off and on  
25 for over 25 years. I worked on the Williams Lines, I've

PM4-38  
confd

PM4-39

## PM4

## Continued, page 90 of 162

PM4-39

The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

91

PM4

Continued, page 91 of 162

1 worked on TransCanada Lines, I've done repairs on both of  
2 them. I'm also a property owner in Douglas and Klamath  
3 Counties. I've lived for over 15 years across the road from  
4 the TransCanada line that runs north and south through  
5 Central Oregon.

6 In my over 20 years' experience working and  
7 living next to a natural gas line, I have seen no adverse  
8 effects on the environment. I repeat, in over 20 years'  
9 experience working on and living next to a natural gas line,  
10 I've seen no adverse effects to the environment. These  
11 lines are safe. They're put in by professionals. They're  
12 monitored continually. I've dug up and done repairs on gas  
13 lines where there's a spot of corrosion the size of a  
14 pinhead they can detect. These things are continually  
15 monitored and they're safe.

16 Natural gas is the cleanest energy available to  
17 us. It's going to be exported whether it goes across Oregon  
18 or it goes across Canada. Canada is working on an LNG  
19 export terminal in British Columbia that is in the process  
20 right now. So one way or another, this gas is going to get  
21 exported and it is the cleanest energy available.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Clarence Adams.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

92

1 MR. ADAMS: Clarence Adams, C-l-a-r-e-n-c-e,  
2 A-d-a-m-s. I am a landowner, mile post 55.8. And also a  
3 member of the Landowners United. I oppose this for the  
4 following reasons among many.

5 I protest the use of eminent domain to take  
6 property from private citizens for the Pacific Connector.  
7 The purpose and need of this project is, and I quote, "a  
8 market-drive response to increasing the availability of  
9 competitive priced gas" unquote. For a Canadian company's  
10 corporate profit only.

11 Williams is not building a pipeline out of a deed  
12 seeded need to help the American public with trade imbalance  
13 or anything so noble.

14 The application states in the DEIS -- applicant,  
15 excuse me, states in the DEIS that 40 million cubic feet per  
16 day will be delivered to the Grants Pass Lateral with the  
17 assumption that that's available for general consumption.  
18 What there is no mention of in the DEIS is that gas is  
19 destined to go to the South Dunes Power Plant so they can  
20 liquefy the natural gas headed to Coos Bay.

21 In my opinion the power plant is part of the  
22 project and should be considered with the DEIS, I don't care  
23 what anybody says.

24 This slight-of-hand trick with the gas -- I lost  
25 my place, so excuse me -- no, this is a slight-of-hand trick

PM4-40

PM4-41

**PM4**

**Continued, page 92 of 162**

PM4-40

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

PM4-41

The South Dunes Power Plant would not liquefy any gas, and would not deliver any natural gas or LNG to Coos Bay. The purpose of the plant is to provide power to the Jordan Cove LNG facility. The power plant would need to be permitted by the State, not FERC. FERC has no authority over this facility.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

93

PM4

Continued, page 93 of 162

1 that was planned as far back as 2007 when Jordon Cove  
2 entered into a very expensive contract with Coos Bay for the  
3 exclusive use of the gas from the 12-inch Coos Bay pipeline.  
4 I believe Veresen knew back then that there was a very real  
5 possibility of exporting gas instead of importing because  
6 they produced plans for the power plant shortly after  
7 applying for export. It was in the works.

8 Nor can the pipeline be called utility line  
9 despite public need. It states in the DEIS that the  
10 Commission decides where the interstate natural gas  
11 transportation facilities in the public need or necessary  
12 and Mr. Friedman himself called the pipeline a welded-steel  
13 transmission line. Not a utility.

14 There's also the issue of safety which is very  
15 near and dear to many of our hearts. I don't care if you  
16 have ten lines or less per mile. I want all the safeguards  
17 I can get. The pipeline will pass within 300 miles -- 300  
18 feet of my place. I realize the chances of a blowup and  
19 explosion may be small, but if it does happen, it's 100  
20 percent disastrous for me. I take exception to that.

21 Williams recognized the low-quality standards  
22 when they agreed to raise construction standards to a level  
23 two to obtain a conditional use permit --

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your time --

25 MR. ADAMS: -- in the coastal zone management

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

94

1 area controlled by Douglas County. If the pipeline goes  
2 through, I believe FERC has the responsibility for public  
3 safety and should require the maximum standards any time the  
4 pipeline passes a residence. And I suggest within twice the  
5 distance of the expected explosion as an added safety  
6 margin.

7 I think the pipeline is a bad idea on very many  
8 levels, environmentally, financially, safety --

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I know you're going to bring  
10 it to a close now.

11 MR. ADAMS: -- one word yet. As an American  
12 citizen being subsidized American company it sucks.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gary Landers.

16 PARTICIPANT: Why are there only three of you up  
17 there?

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: He had to go to the restroom.

19 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.) You know, where  
20 is the other chair? Can I say something again about that?

21 MS. LIBERATORE: No doubt, my colleague had a  
22 good reason for leaving the table, but the fact is that  
23 these comments are going in the record. And we're listening  
24 and they're being recorded and they will be responded to  
25 whether you have a full table up here or not.

PM4-42

## PM4

## Continued, page 94 of 162

PM4-42

The DOT, not FERC, regulates pipeline safety, they establish the standards associated with Class 1 through 4. The DEIS discloses the DOT requirements.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

95

PM4

Continued, page 95 of 162

1 PARTICIPANT: Do you see how that feels to us,  
2 how that looks to us?  
3 MS. LIBERATORE: I do. But I can't speak for why  
4 people have to get up and leave the table. I think we can  
5 assume that they have your good interest in mind and there's  
6 no hostility intended by it.  
7 MR. LANDERS: Gary Landers.  
8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Wait, Gary.  
9 MR. LANDERS: Yes.  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Hold on a sec. After Gary we have  
11 July Oatfield, Jonah Majure and Bobbee Murr.  
12 MR. LANDERS: Gary Landers, North Bay Road, Hangs  
13 Inlet, Northbend. L-a-n-d-e-r-s.  
14 Safe, I ask you to consider the Williams LNG  
15 plant in Plymouth, Washington. March 31st, 2014, a pipeline  
16 within the LNG facility exploded right next to an LNG tank.  
17 And the tank was actually breached by shrapnel. The pipe  
18 explosion was felt three to six miles away and heard 20  
19 miles away. Residents were evacuated from a two-mile  
20 radius. Gas sickened rescue workers.  
21 There have been at least three other major gas  
22 explosions in the Pacific Northwest in the past 15 years.  
23 The Plymouth plant was well built, inspected, and  
24 certified. But to use a very technical trades term, shit  
25 happens. It could happen here.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

96

1 I like Canada. My wife was born in Canada. It's  
2 beautiful country with many wonderful people. That having  
3 been said, I believe that if their companies desire to take  
4 private land to make their pipeline more profitable, then  
5 the land should be Canadian land, not American.

6 FERC staff wrote in its draft EIS that we are  
7 unable to identify any other alternative port location on  
8 the Pacific Coast of the United States for an LNG terminal  
9 that could meet the objectives of Jordan Cove project and  
10 that would have significant environmental advantages over  
11 Coos Bay.

12 Why are we Americans so concerned about meeting  
13 the objectives of Canadian projects? Simply put, their  
14 objective is to maximize a Canadian company's profit. Coos  
15 Bay is not the only practical LPG export location on the  
16 west coast, it's just a very profitable one for Canadians.  
17 There are at least 26 other proposed or existing LPG  
18 terminals on the west coast, in Alaska, in Mexico and on  
19 Canadian land. They don't need to take Oregon land for  
20 their economic interests. There are six existing or  
21 proposed LNG facilities on the west coast in Mexico. In  
22 Alaska there are two more, one in Warrenton on Alaska's own  
23 and Canada's own soil there are currently 18 proposed LNG  
24 projects. Locations are near Vancouver, British Columbia,  
25 Canada, four proposed locations are in Kennebec B.C. Canada,

PM4

Continued, page 96 of 162

PM4-43

Comment noted. The reason FERC is considering the project is because it has received an application for the project. Under U.S. law, it is FERC's responsibility to analyze the proposal in the application.

PM4-43

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

97

1 seven in Prince Rupert B.C. Canada, one in Kitsalt B.C.  
2 Canada, and one in Steward B.C. Canada.  
3 Veresen wants to take our land by eminent domain  
4 or a certificate of public convenience, a necessity, if we  
5 don't want to give it to them cheaply. For CPMC  
6 condemnation of our land, you need conclusive evidence that  
7 the transmission line for which the land is required is for  
8 public use and necessary for public convenience. American  
9 public, not Canadian.  
10 Surely there is somewhere in Canada Veresen can  
11 find a place to make a profit exporting gas. Let them do it  
12 on their own soil, we in Oregon have little to gain and much  
13 to lose.  
14 Thank you.  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
16 (Applause.)  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Julie Oatfield.  
18 MS. OATFIELD: Hi, there, my name is Julie  
19 Oatfield, O-a-t-f-i-e-l-d, just like a field of oats. I  
20 think you -- sorry about that. I thank you very much for  
21 being here and taking the time to be here.  
22 I am a 19-year-old student here in Oregon  
23 studying biology and history. So I have a lot of opinions  
24 and a lot of emotions behind this.  
25 One of my main concerns of many for opposing --

PM4-43  
cont'd

PM4-44

**PM4**

**Continued, page 97 of 162**

PM4-44

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

98

PM4

Continued, page 98 of 162

1 that relate to me opposing this project are all the salmon,  
2 the different kinds of sea turtles, and the other 30 kinds  
3 of endangered species that are at risk if there's an oil  
4 spill. And although they're not endangered, human beings  
5 are pretty cool and we should be looking out for their  
6 safety as well.

7 So, the direct effects that these endangered  
8 species would feel from an oil spill are, being like  
9 physically covered in oil, being unable to survive, the  
10 forests nearby becoming even more flammable if there is an  
11 explosion of natural gas through these pipelines.

12 But not only are these direct effects on the  
13 organisms themselves, but on the ecosystem that support  
14 them. Obviously global climate change is something that  
15 directly affects the organisms by creating absurd weather  
16 conditions that most of us can survive. Humans, the elderly  
17 and children especially can be affected by extreme heat, by  
18 certain icy storms as well as sea level rise that threatens  
19 where we live, the ability to grow food, because the salt  
20 water comes in, it makes things so much more difficult, so  
21 much more of a hassle.

22 And although I have great respect for the union  
23 workers who are support fair wage labor, local job, all of  
24 that great stuff, my parents are union workers, as well, I  
25 must stand in solidarity first with humanity, with all

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

99

PM4

Continued, page 99 of 162

1 living beings on this planet in the interest of public  
2 safety instead of just jobs. As much as I love jobs, they  
3 should be really ones in clean energy. Because a kind of a  
4 happy spin on it is that an oil spill looks disgusting, but  
5 a solar spill is what we call a sunny day. So let's try and  
6 aim for that instead of these terrifying explosions which we  
7 have seen way too many of over the past -- God, I hate to  
8 say, year -- but there have been a lot in the past year  
9 alone. Sorry, this is a very emotional issue and I really  
10 hope that you make the right decision.

11 Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Nest  
14 is Jonah Majure.

15 MR. MAJURE: Yeah, my name is Jonah Majure,  
16 M-a-j-u-r-e. I'm a farmer here in solidarity with farmers  
17 in Oregon and around the country whose lives and livelihood  
18 is threatened by the fossil fuel industry through the  
19 pipelines and extraction.

20 At 23, just like Julie, I'm directly impacted by  
21 the destruction of the climate all to benefit the profits of  
22 the 1 percent. People my age and younger always have their  
23 human rights respected less than profit.

24 FERC has a duty to protect national interest and  
25 this project is not in their national or human interests.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

100

PM4

Continued, page 100 of 162

1 FERC's duties are based on the public trust doctrine just  
2 like all other federal, state, and local agencies.

3 As trustees to our human rights and the rights of  
4 nature, FERC has a duty to evaluate all decisions in light  
5 of the national comprehensive climate recovery plan and a  
6 right to a healthy atmosphere. This constitutional and  
7 public trust obligation is to present and future  
8 generations, those not even born yet.

PM4-45

9 FERC also has a duty to protect our human right  
10 to clean water and healthy watersheds. The increase in  
11 fracking and dangerous pipelines threatens our most vital  
12 public trust resource, water. The depletion and  
13 contamination of watersheds puts farmers out of work by  
14 ensuring no crops can grow and no animals can graze on their  
15 land ever again.

16 This and other fossil fuel projects are also in  
17 violation of our civil rights. Indigenous peoples and  
18 communities of color are disproportionately harmed and  
19 killed by a poisoned environment. As we've seen with the  
20 cases of police violence around the nation, people of color  
21 do not have the government defending their human rights  
22 before the profits of the wealthy elite.

23 We've seen that capitalism creates these direct  
24 conflicts of interest to our government's public trust  
25 duties. Politicians can accept money from profit interests

PM4-45

Comment noted.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

101

PM4

Continued, page 101 of 162

1 and appoint regulators who are from the very industries they  
2 are supposed to regulate. Members from the Obama  
3 administration have already gone on to be well-paid  
4 executives in the gas industry including companies that have  
5 won FERC approval.

6 If the federal, state, and local governments  
7 continue to illegally violate their constitutional public  
8 trust and statutory duties by approving this project or any  
9 other fossil fuel projects, then we as citizens have duties  
10 to take legal action and direct action to make sure that our  
11 constitutional rights are being protected.

12 I came here with a group of people who maybe have  
13 a little grayer hair than I do, but I know that if I'm still  
14 doing this when I have gray hair, chances are I will have  
15 already died from the effects of climate change.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

19 After Bobbee, we have Kelly O'Hanley, Kevin  
20 Martonick, Michael Horner, and Jean Towns. So please line  
21 up behind Bobbee.

22 MS. MURR: Bobbee, B-o-b-b-e-e, B as in Bravo,  
23 Murr, M as in Mary, u-r-r.

24 I'm here as an individual and I believe the  
25 Commission should deny all permits. There are a bunch of

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

102

PM4

Continued, page 102 of 162

1 reasons why, but the main reason that got me up here was, I  
2 see people here locally who fish, farm, own land, and  
3 they're being asked to leave their livelihoods and their  
4 land for whatever money might be thrown at them. And I  
5 think this sort of eminent domain is illegal and immoral and  
6 I'm here to say they deserve to farm, fish, live on their  
7 land with no natural gas project going through it.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

11 Next is Kelly.

12 MS. O'HANLEY: Hi, I'm Kelly O'Hanley, K-e-l-l-y,  
13 O'Hanley, O-'- capital H-a-n-l-e-y. The purpose of my  
14 testimony is to call attention to the effects on wildlife  
15 that would be caused by the building of an LNG pipeline  
16 across the state of Oregon. Pipeline construction would  
17 likely have substantial, unintended, and deleterious  
18 consequences on forest habitats.

19 A 95-foot swath of clear cut forest through 75  
20 miles of public forest by definition, fragments a forest,  
21 and creates extensive new forest edges. Most ecologists  
22 will tell you that imbalance, forest fragmentation and  
23 additional forest edges are a bad thing. Many forest  
24 dwelling species avoid forest edges. Therefore, both  
25 dispersal and general connectivity are decreased. Habitat

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

103

PM4

Continued, page 103 of 162

1 loss negatively affects breeding success and foraging  
2 success.

3 Also, there is usually a higher predation,  
4 pressure, along forest edges. Edge habitats experience  
5 microclimate changes including increased evaporation,  
6 increased temperature, increased incident solar radiation,  
7 and decreased available soil moisture. Examples of species  
8 known to have been negatively affected by forest  
9 fragmentation include -- excuse me -- pine martins, brown  
10 creepers, spotted owls, and gray wolves.

11 An additional negative effect of a band of  
12 deforested land is that it provides a gateway for  
13 introduction of non-native invasive species.

14 The collateral damage caused by the pipeline  
15 affects species that unfortunately are not able to come here  
16 to testify on their own behalf. I am their poor messenger.  
17 I pray that you will keep these animals and their welfare in  
18 your minds and hearts. If you do so, there's only one right  
19 answer that would protect their well being. That is no to  
20 proceeding with an LNG pipeline across the state of Oregon.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

24 Next is Kevin.

25 MR. MARTONICK: Yes, this is Kevin Martonick,

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

104

1 M-a-r-t-o-n-i-c-k. The Department of Energy has determined  
2 that exporting natural gas could cause up to 1.2 million  
3 manufacturing jobs to be lost to overseas factories. This  
4 is from a Department of Energy NERA study in 2012. On the  
5 other hand, the Jordan Cove project would generate only 100  
6 permanent full-time jobs for local workers.

7 Clearly this is a losing situation for local  
8 workers and for the U.S.

9 Additionally the Jordan Cove LNG project will  
10 pass through 300 private lands; 90 percent of the landowners  
11 have said no to the use of their land for ten years. Can it  
12 be made any more clear that this project is a bad idea?

13 Add to this the environmental impact, the danger  
14 of the terminal to be built in the earthquakes abduction  
15 zone, and tsunami area of Coos Bay in considering what kind  
16 of world we want to hand future generations. There really  
17 should be no question as to what the correct course of  
18 action is.

19 We just really need to consider, I think,  
20 alternative forms of renewable energy and the technology is  
21 here for that. A generator that makes electricity from wave  
22 power is being prepared for installation. This is back in  
23 2011. But for installation some two and a half miles off  
24 the Oregon coast. This is from the Oregon wave energy trust  
25 and I would like to ask you to consider projects like this

PM4-46

**PM4**

**Continued, page 104 of 162**

PM4-46

Renewable energy options are discussed in section 3.1.4 of the EIS. Because the Project's purpose is to prepare natural gas for export to foreign and domestic markets, the development or use of renewable energy technology would not be a reasonable alternative to the proposed action.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

105

PM4

Continued, page 105 of 162

1 instead.

2 Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

5 Michael Horner, Jean Townes, Elle Leathan and

6 Mary Addams.

7 MR. HORNER: Hi, my name is Mike Horner,

8 H-o-r-n-e-r. I'm here tonight to voice my objection to a a

9 plan so fraught with public danger and environmental risk

10 that it's hard to know where to start. I think first that

11 we must dispute and dispel the myth that fracked methane gas

12 is a climate friendly fuel and a bridge to a clean energy

13 future. It is incorrect to promote the idea that the

14 lifecycle emissions from the fracking process are limited to

15 simply the ones produced by the end use of the gas. All

16 along the way, methane leakage rates from well operations,

17 processing, and transportation are so significant as to make

18 them as bad or worse than coal or oil.

19 In several recent peer-reviewed studies including

20 by Harvard and Stanford researchers investigating all phases

21 of methane production and processing, the emissions were 50

22 percent higher than the EPA and DOE's working estimates. In

23 the interest of time, I've submitted the sources for your

24 review.

25 The next most egregious error in the reasoning

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

106

1 behind this proposal has to do with geologic time. As you  
2 must know, in the geologic record of the northwest, there is  
3 irrefutable evidence of periodic subduction zone earthquakes  
4 off the northwest coast. Every three to 400 years, a major  
5 8.0 to 9.0 earthquake has produced a tsunami large enough  
6 and far enough inland to leave a discernible debris and sand  
7 layer in the geologic record.

8 We know for certain that the last such cataclysm  
9 was in January of 1700, 314 years ago. The next event is  
10 due any year now. To approve a storage and processing  
11 facility that's literally guaranteed to be inundated is  
12 beyond outrageous. It speaks volumes though about the  
13 disregard by corporate forces for the safety and well being  
14 of citizens when pursuing profit. The best the backers can  
15 do is promise a few jobs in exchange for the huge risk to  
16 life, property, and the environment.

17 The people of Southern Oregon who won't manage to  
18 get one of those jobs can look forward to the taking of  
19 their lands by a Canadian energy giant and an energy future  
20 heading in exactly the wrong direction. The way forward is  
21 clean, renewable energies and a stable climate. I implore  
22 you to review the methodologies and assumptions underpinning  
23 the EIS analysis.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Next

PM4

Continued, page 106 of 162

PM4-47

The methods and assumptions have been reviewed by agencies and the public. FERC has considered comments on these factors and responded to them in this appendix to the FEIS. Changes have been made where appropriate.

PM4-47

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

107

PM4

Continued, page 107 of 162

1 is Jean Townes.  
2 MS. TOWNES: It's Jean, J-e-a-n, Townes,  
3 T-o-w-n-e-s. It is a moral imperative that an EIS in these  
4 times must consider not just the local effects of a project,  
5 but also the effects on the planet we all share. The  
6 environmental impacts of this project are far beyond just  
7 the lands ecosystems and people along the pipeline and in  
8 Coos Bay. The regulatory and permitting considerations that  
9 are being used were developed in the context of the stable  
10 climate that we have had. That time has past, and the  
11 climate is in a deepening crisis.

12 Permitting new infrastructure to support the  
13 extraction, export, and burning of additional fossil fuels  
14 in the context of the developing global climate crisis is  
15 immoral.

16 The DEIS devotes a few pages out of 5,048 to  
17 considering climate change. After admitting that climate  
18 change is real, it concludes that, quote, "Although the  
19 project emissions would contribute to the overall amount of  
20 atmospheric greenhouse gases, it is impossible to quantify  
21 the impacts that the emissions of GHG from construction and  
22 operation of the project would have on climate change. So  
23 because it is not possible to quantify exactly how the  
24 emissions from this project affect the climate crisis, it is  
25 apparently not necessary to consider it further. This

PM4-48

PM4-48

See the response to CO10-3.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

108

PM4

Continued, page 108 of 162

1 project will generate a significant increase in greenhouse  
2 gas emissions in the extraction, transportation, processing  
3 and burning of natural gas.

PM4-48  
confd

4 The gas moving through the pipeline will be  
5 coming from fracked gas wells, both current and new, which  
6 contaminate groundwater and which NOAA has found leak large  
7 amounts of methane which is a greenhouse gas, 86 or 30,  
8 depending on who you ask, more potent than CO2. The new  
9 power plant that will be built to power the operations of  
10 the facility will emit large amounts of CO2.

11 The ships transporting the LNG will be burning  
12 fossil fuels and the gas when it gets burned in Asia will  
13 add large amounts of heat-trapping CO2 to the atmosphere.  
14 Permitting this project is only about enabling investors to  
15 make a lot of money. What about our moral responsibility to  
16 the children and grandchildren of this planet? What about  
17 the people of Bangladesh, the Pacific Islands and Miami who  
18 are being affected by flooding driven by the rise of sea  
19 levels? What about the disruption of water supplies for the  
20 countries depending on snow melt from the Himalayas? What  
21 about severe droughts and agricultural reasons which are  
22 significantly reducing harvests? What about the melting of  
23 the permafrost which will release enormous amounts of  
24 climate changing methane into the atmosphere? What about  
25 the dying coral reefs and the juvenile clams that can no



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

109

1 longer form shells because of ocean acidification?  
2 In this world of climate crisis, all of our  
3 environmental impact decisions must begin with making the  
4 potential effects of the climate the centerpiece of any EIS.  
5 It is our moral responsibility to do everything that we can  
6 to leave a livable planet for our descendants and for all  
7 the living beings that depend on this beautiful earth.  
8 Approving this project would be abdicating that  
9 responsibility.  
10 To quote Philosopher Kathleen Dean Moore, "it is  
11 wrong to wreck the planet."  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
13 (Applause.)  
14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ellen Leathan, Mary Addams, Jason  
15 Monk, Charles Johnson.  
16 MS. ADDAMS: Mary Addams, A-d-d-a-m-s. FERC  
17 staff has concluded that approval of this project will be  
18 felt in some limited adverse environmental impacts, but  
19 mitigation efforts will substantially reduce them.  
20 Well, you know what, mitigation hardly ever  
21 works, and it's never as good as the real thing.  
22 This project will destroy old growth forests as  
23 well as habitat for endangered species. How does FERC or  
24 Veresen -- I don't know if I'm pronouncing that right -- one  
25 of the foreign companies that is planning this project plan

PM4-49

PM4-50

**PM4**

**Continued, page 109 of 162**

PM4-49

Climate change was addressed in section 4.14.3.12 of the DEIS. Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project were discussed in section 4.12.1.4 of the DEIS. See response to IND1-1.

PM4-50

Unless otherwise required by federal, state, or local regulations, no compensatory mitigation, beyond restoration of disturbed areas, is required for general impacts to forested habitats. Exceptions to this (i.e., where impacts to forests would legally require mitigation) include, but are not limited to, areas where impacts to MAMU nesting habitats or LSRs would occur.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

110

PM4

Continued, page 110 of 162

1 to mitigate the destruction of an old growth forest. It  
2 takes hundreds of years to create an old growth forest and  
3 all the intricate life forms that interact so perfectly  
4 within it. It's impossible to mitigate the damage or  
5 recreate the webs of life that live within this forest.  
6 The BLM, the Umpqua National Forest, Roe River  
7 National Forest, and the Winema National Forest managers  
8 will all be told to amend their environmental standards so  
9 that a foreign company can then be legally allowed to reek  
10 havoc on our lands, water, wildlife, and marine life. In  
11 addition, our own government will allow Oregonian's lands  
12 and homes to be condemned via eminent domain and our land  
13 given to these foreign companies in order to build a  
14 230-mile pipeline through our state. The gas will then be  
15 processed in Coos Bay under extreme pressure to turn it into  
16 LNG and export it to Asian markets.  
17 FERC is willing to allow our natural resources to  
18 be destroyed, to have our homes and lands to be taken from  
19 us, and given to a foreign company, and to build and operate  
20 an extremely dangerous and potentially explosive LNG  
21 processing plant in Coos Bay in an earthquake and tsunami  
22 region which I don't think FERC addresses, and then export  
23 this fossil fuel to Asian markets for burning. How is this  
24 in Oregon's best interests? How is this reducing greenhouse  
25 gas emissions? You want us to take all the risks, in return

PM4-50  
conf'd

PM4-51

PM4-51

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

111

1 for some jobs that might last a year or two.  
2 I read the summary of the DEIS and I did not see  
3 you address the climate impacts of fracking or the burning  
4 of all the fossil fuel. Climate policy experts and  
5 scientists are warning that it may already be too late to  
6 prevent our planet's atmosphere from rising 3.6 degrees  
7 Fahrenheit, the tipping point at which the world will be  
8 locked into a future of drought, food, and water shortages,  
9 melting ice sheets, rising sea levels, and widespread  
10 flooding.

11 Natural gas is a fossil fuel and when produced  
12 and burned releases greenhouse gases such as methane and  
13 carbon dioxide into our atmosphere and oceans causing them  
14 to warm up. How is this project going to mitigate global  
15 warming? It will only exasperate the problem.

16 Asia's appetite for energy is increasing. They  
17 will continue to burn oil and coal in addition to the LNG we  
18 provide. The world has to stop the use of fossil fuels if  
19 we hope to give our grandchildren a livable planet. This  
20 project must be stopped.

21 Many of those who speak in favor of this project  
22 are those who want to make money from it. Everyone wants  
23 someone else to take its responsibility for global warming  
24 while they themselves make money from a project. Yes, we  
25 need jobs, but not in the fossil fuel industry.

PM4-52

**PM4**

**Continued, page 111 of 162**

PM4-52

Fracking, or hydraulic fracturing, is used during exploration and production of natural gas. As stated in our response to IND1-2, the FERC does not regulate the exploration or production of natural gas. In fact, fracking is not part of the Project; and therefore, the environmental impacts associated with that activity will not be analyzed in our environmental document. See response to IND1-3.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

112

PM4

Continued, page 112 of 162

1           Okay. I can't finish. But I'll just say, we as  
2 Oregonians, we must stand up and say, this project will not  
3 be built.

4           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
5           (Applause.)

6           MR. FRIEDMAN: Ellen Leathan?

7           MS. LEATHAN: My name is Ellen Leathan, E-l-l-e-n  
8 L-e-a-t-h-a-n. I speak as a grandmother and for all the  
9 grandmothers. I taught in inner-city schools my entire  
10 working career.

11           (Chorus of can't hear you.)

12           MS. LEATHAN: I'm sorry. I've taught in blue  
13 collared schools. I'm sorry that so many of our local union  
14 members had to leave because it is getting -- it is --

15           PARTICIPANT: I can't hear you.

16           MS. LEATHAN: I'm so sorry. I taught at  
17 inner-city schools. I know about jobs. My father was  
18 working on a roof when he was nine. Jobs are important, but  
19 this company and this project chose Coos Bay for the most  
20 cynical reasons. Because it's close to California south,  
21 easier routes and California wouldn't let it in. And Coos  
22 Bay needs jobs. This whole part of Oregon needs jobs. But  
23 this isn't the right one.

24           One of the reasons that it's the wrong one is  
25 that it's a Canadian company. And Canadian companies have a

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

113

PM4

Continued, page 113 of 162

1 reputation. They come and they leave and they leave messes.  
2 We know about them, but there's New Jersey, there's  
3 Pennsylvania, and one I just learned about tonight. Canada  
4 has made the tar sands a no-fly zone so that you can't see  
5 what's happening there. Private people can't see. I  
6 understand that the only records of pipeline accidents in  
7 Canada that are publicly available are the accidents that  
8 happen on the lands of reservations of native Americans.  
9 Those pipelines were put through by eminent domain and the  
10 only records of the accidents are coming from there.  
11 Because government doesn't send them out. Canada should put  
12 their LNG plants on the Canadian coast if they're going to  
13 be so stupid and short-sighted.  
14 We've talked a lot about global warming and I'm  
15 not going to talk about that except to say that the Pentagon  
16 itself is planning on what they're going to do with our  
17 naval bases on the Atlantic coast when the water rises  
18 because they know the waters are rising.  
19 What are we going to do in Coos Bay when the  
20 global changes bring huge storms, another typhoon, a  
21 Columbus Day storm with higher water levels? What's going  
22 to happen in all of our bays? And especially, what's going  
23 to happen where we've drilled, dredged holes in sand for  
24 supertankers -- explosive supertankers? Good God.  
25 I hope that you will consider the veracity of

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

114

PM4

Continued, page 114 of 162

1 those Canadian companies plans for mitigation. And I hope  
2 that you'll also consider that the mitigation that's the  
3 bribe is the kind of management that should be happening on  
4 our public forests already with our tax money.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

8 Next is Jason Monk.

9 MR. MONK: Hi, I'm Jason Monk, J-a-s-o-n M-o-n-k.

10 Cool.

11 I am here tonight to express my opposition to the  
12 proposed LNG terminal at Coos Bay. Having reviewed some of  
13 the data compiled on this project, I think that the proposal  
14 to build this terminal is destructive to the community and  
15 Coos Bay and the whole northwest region.

16 It would entail an insane degree of risk. Only  
17 an entity so selfish as to prioritize corporate profits over  
18 the safety and well-being of real people could possibly  
19 entertain the notion that this may be a good idea.

20 The pipeline to the facility would require clear  
21 cutting of public and private land and with imperil the  
22 safety of local residents who would be at risk for gas  
23 leaks, explosions, and pollution to the environment. The  
24 facility itself would store a million cubic feet of LNG that  
25 would be at risk of exploding. The geologic record of our

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

115

PM4

Continued, page 115 of 162

1 region indicates that we can expect a major earthquake in  
2 our area within a few decades. The facility is an  
3 unnecessary risk and the project should be abandoned.  
4 And the environment impact of using LNG should  
5 not be underestimated. Methane has 86 times the warming  
6 potential to affect our climate than does carbon dioxide.  
7 The warning signs are obvious. We must stop pursuing  
8 development of fossil fuel infrastructure while there is  
9 still time to change the course.  
10 And I just wanted to speak from my heart. I'm  
11 26, I am very passionate about living with the land and I  
12 want to pursue a life in sustainable agriculture and  
13 farming. And I feel that this project directly contradicts  
14 all of those goals and that in fact inhibits my own dreams  
15 as well as many other young people who just want to grow  
16 some food.  
17 Furthermore, this project would exacerbate  
18 climate change which disproportionately affects people of  
19 color and communities that are not represented at this  
20 hearing. There are many island nations that will in a few  
21 years be submerged because of rising ocean levels and I feel  
22 that this is unconscionable as an ethical issue.  
23 Thank you for your time.  
24 (Applause.)  
25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

116

PM4

Continued, page 116 of 162

1 Next we have Charles Johnson, then Taiz Medalia,  
2 then Lowen Berman.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Charles Johnson, the  
4 conventional spelling. And I would like to confirm, Ms.  
5 LaFleur is still the Chairwoman of the FERC?

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Currently, yes. Although, believe  
7 it or not, she has agreed to be replaced by one of her  
8 peers.

9 MR. JOHNSON: And she's the only woman on the  
10 panel -- on the FERC?

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: We're thinking who the  
12 Commissioners are. I think you're correct.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Not surprising.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, they labeled her chairman, not  
16 chairperson, not chairwoman, but chairman. Anyway, I hope  
17 my time can start now.

18 You know, as we see from some of these crazy  
19 projects, humanity is not all it's cracked up to be.  
20 However, crimes against humanity and crimes against nature  
21 are still serious issues. And I think we've got one right  
22 here. I didn't see any responsible forestry logos. I don't  
23 know where the paper from this thing came from. I don't  
24 know why it's so thick because all you had to do was make an  
25 on-line document that talked about no mitigation and



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

117

PM4

Continued, page 117 of 162

1 sequestering anywhere close to the amount of carbon that's  
2 going to come out from from this idiotic proposal and that  
3 would have been the end if we were true to the principles of  
4 this country and what this country has said about climate  
5 change.

6 But this isn't really about this country. It's  
7 about a lot of money going to a Canadian corporation and a  
8 few -- a very few short-term jobs and -- or excuse me, a few  
9 short-term jobs and very few long-term jobs.

10 The concerns of unionized workers who I do  
11 empathize with, I know they want to have good, preferably  
12 long-term work that supports their family, but we're really  
13 barking up the wrong tree. This country has plenty of work  
14 that we need to do to infrastructure that could actually  
15 improve the quality of life instead of degrading the quality  
16 of life here in Oregon and especially southern Oregon.

17 So, I hope that you will -- I don't know what you  
18 really should do with this. We can't burn it because that  
19 releases carbon.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. JOHNSON: But be more honest. I was glad  
22 that some of these things came out up here with the FERC  
23 being funded by the industry it regulates. If you cannot  
24 come to the correct moral and scientific decision, and  
25 obstruct this plan, this whole plan, these two projects, I

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

118

1 hope that you will at least encourage and point out that  
2 it's in the national interest that America retains money  
3 from this project to mitigate the idiocy of what you'll be  
4 approving. Money should not be going to fund FERC, money  
5 should be going into mitigation of excessive carbon use in  
6 the United States. And I do hope that there will be a  
7 further summary when you do the final environmental impact  
8 statement that will clearly talk about the carbon volumes  
9 and --  
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
11 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you very much.  
12 (Applause.)  
13 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. So let's clarify how  
14 FERC is funded. And, of course, all of this is public  
15 information that you can get on the Internet. It's no  
16 secret. We are a line item in the budget passed by the U.S.  
17 Congress. However, we're called a revenue neutral agency.  
18 The government, through the Commission, gets back the money  
19 that Congress gives us through fees it charges to the  
20 industries we regulate so that we are not a burden to the  
21 tax holders -- taxpayers and, of course, those are  
22 arrangements made between the United States Congress.  
23 MS. MEDALIA: Hello, my name is Taizz Medalia,  
24 that's T-a-i-z-z M-e-d-a-l-i-a. Thanks for taking comment  
25 on this.

PM4-53

## PM4

## Continued, page 118 of 162

PM4-53

Climate change was addressed in section 4.14.3.12 of the DEIS. Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project were discussed in section 4.12.1.4 of the DEIS. See response to IND1-1.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

119

1 Working as a respiratory therapist for 30 years  
2 has made me aware that it's a lot easier to prevent  
3 respiratory disease than to treat it once it's occurred.  
4 And I think, you know, breathing is one of my favorite  
5 activities.  
6 (Laughter.)  
7 MS. MEDALIA: And it's something we're all  
8 probably going to have to do. So, my area of concern is  
9 that the diesel-powered vessels that will be transporting  
10 LNG from this project will significantly increase the diesel  
11 particulate matter that we will be exposed to. And this is  
12 a major cause of respiratory disease and a major cause of  
13 cardiovascular disease and death.  
14 And unfortunately the communities closest to  
15 these vessels will be disproportionately affected by the  
16 exposure. So I would like to ask if the DEIS has considered  
17 and will quantify the amount of increase in diesel  
18 particulate matter and how many more cases of respiratory  
19 and cardiovascular disease and deaths will occur? That's a  
20 big area of concern, I think.  
21 Another area of concern is safety. We're not  
22 talking about transporting potatoes. You know, we're  
23 talking about transporting something that's flammable and  
24 explosive. And I think there's been a number of speakers  
25 talk about this and witnessing the devastation that it's

PM4-54

**PM4**

**Continued, page 119 of 162**

PM4-54

It has not. The Project does not involve the use of diesel engines except as emergency engines (and temporary engines for construction), and the extent to which DPM health impacts can be quantified is highly speculative. EPA's 2002 "Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust" (EPA/600/8-90/057F, May 2002, pp. 8-15 and 8-16) stated that "The estimated possible risk ranges (10-5 to 10-3 as well as lower and zero risk) provide a perspective of the potential significance of the lung cancer hazard. The perspective should not be viewed as a definitive quantitative characterization of risk....Further research is needed to more accurately assess and characterize environmental cancer risks of [diesel exhaust]."

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

120

1 caused.

2 And I was struck by the complete inadequacy of  
3 the emergency response plans in the DEIS. It's sort of  
4 like, we'll think about this later.

5 Now, having been a first responder myself, I just  
6 have to ask how you could put together such an incomplete  
7 response to what would be almost inconceivable devastation  
8 if an explosive and flammable product does what explosive  
9 and flammable products do. So I would encourage you to  
10 include that.

11 And finally, I'd like to ask respectfully how  
12 such a project could possibly be in the public interest.  
13 Thanks very much.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: After Lowen Berman, we've got  
17 Daniel Serres, Liz Hyde and Barbara B.

18 MR. BERMAN: Hello, I am Lowen Berman, L-o-w-e-n  
19 B-e-r-m-a-n. I'm a retired union member, journeyman  
20 machinist. For the first time in human history -- excuse me  
21 -- the sky really is falling. Climate change is the  
22 greatest challenge facing humanity now or perhaps ever in  
23 its history. To suggest that LNG is a bridge fuel is a  
24 solution to climate change would be the same as arguing that  
25 throwing kerosene on a fire is a good way to put it out

PM4-55

**PM4**

**Continued, page 120 of 162**

PM4-55

The DEIS discloses the likely Tsunami hazards, earthquake, liquefaction and subsidence issues in section 4.2 in considerable detail.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

121

PM4

Continued, page 121 of 162

1 because kerosene is less flammable than gasoline.

2 LNG is not a bridge fuel, it is a bridge to  
3 catastrophe. Putting any resources into new fossil fuel  
4 infrastructure is simply madness. All available resources  
5 must be used to expand sustainable energy production and  
6 conservation.

7 Some argue that LNG, which is methane, is less  
8 polluting than other petroleum products because it produces  
9 less CO2 when burned. But in fact, methane is 30 times more  
10 potent than CO2 as a heat trapping gas and it is estimated  
11 that 3 percent of the methane extracted and transported in  
12 LNG production will be leaked directly into the atmosphere.

13 And please note that Jordan Cove is not a  
14 replacement for existing fossil fuel infrastructure. It's  
15 in addition to an already out-of-control problem.

16 I beg of you to stop this insanity and say no to  
17 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector pipeline and all other  
18 fossil fuel infrastructure expansion.

19 Several of my union brothers here have expressed  
20 the view that they want jobs but not at the expense of the  
21 environment. I have to say with all due respect that if you  
22 look at the overall impact of this project on the  
23 environment, there's no way you can make that statement or  
24 no way you can expect that the jobs will not be at the  
25 expense of the environment. And I would ask you to ask your

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

122

PM4

Continued, page 122 of 162

1 unions, your organizations to join the environmental  
2 movement in working for a sustained energy future. Believe  
3 me, there are plenty of jobs out there for wind, solar,  
4 geothermal, and who knows what other kinds of energy that  
5 will have to be produced to completely revamp the U.S.  
6 energy system.

7 Believe me, also, I know what unemployment is  
8 like. I have experienced it. So thank you very much and if  
9 you folks are paying any attention to what you're hearing  
10 tonight, I don't imagine how you could possibly approve  
11 this.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Daniel Serres.

15 MR. SERRES: My name is Dan Serres, S-e-r-r-e-s.

16 I'm here representing Friends of Living Oregon Waters, FLOW  
17 and Columbia River Keeper for whom I am the conservation  
18 director.

19 This has been a bad idea ten years in the making.  
20 Many of the people in this room are aware of the bait and  
21 switch that's underlying this entire project. It came in to  
22 this community in southern Oregon promoting itself as an LNG  
23 import facility, the sky was falling, we had to have gas  
24 from overseas, we needed it now. For years they lied  
25 through their teeth knowing full well they intended to flip

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

123

1 this from an import to export project. It's offensive to  
2 even consider the idea of putting farmers, foresters,  
3 fishermen, and all the people who live along this pipeline  
4 at risk, having their livelihoods put at risk.

5 So I would urge FERC to reject this project  
6 outright. I wanted to state that obvious point first.

7 I also want to point out some flaws in the NEPA  
8 document. First of all, it fails to adequately evaluate the  
9 alternatives to the projects and to take a broader view of  
10 LNG exports throughout the nation in a programmatic way  
11 which we think is a fatal flaw with this. The cumulative  
12 impacts analysis is cursory and inadequate. And the  
13 document is deficient in disclosing impacts to human health  
14 and the environment. I just want to point out the safety  
15 analysis, one, isn't complete. Also it's hard to know  
16 whether it's safe enough to build this thing.

17 The NEPA documentation is inadequate for an  
18 agency like the Coast Guard to justify its letter of  
19 recommendation for this project. It's also not adequate to  
20 justify a certificate of convenience to this project because  
21 the safety impacts are really unimaginable. Just a few  
22 months, or about a year ago a facility in Plymouth,  
23 Washington, an LNG facility that's much smaller than what's  
24 proposed on the south coast had a puncture, a rupture and  
25 they had to evacuate two miles around that facility. That

PM4-56

PM4-57

PM4-58

**PM4**

**Continued, page 123 of 162**

PM4-56

FERC responds to each application individually; it does not consider all possible projects in a programmatic assessment and pick a winner. In this case, there are at least two projects in Oregon being considered in separate EISs. The Commission may approve one or both of these. There are others along the Pacific Coast that chapter 3 discusses also. FERC lets the market decide which, if any, are built.

PM4-57

This comment fails to point out any specific deficiencies. The analysis was prepared in compliance with NEPA regulations and includes best available science. The cumulative effects analysis is found in section 4.14. Impacts to human health and safety are addressed in section 4.13. Impacts to the "environment" are addressed in chapter 4.

PM4-58

This comment fails to point out any specific deficiencies. The analysis was prepared in compliance with NEPA regulations and includes best available science. The Coast Guard is a cooperating agency for this NEPA analysis, and has been working closely with the FERC on the EIS analysis.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

124

1 would be most, if not all of North Bend.

2 It's not going to work, it's a bad idea, it's  
3 poorly cited.

4 In terms of the dredging, this is an absolutely,  
5 jaw-droppingly huge amount of dredging and excavation in  
6 Coos Bay. DEQ called the Bradwood LNG facility which the  
7 state of Oregon wisely projected, one of the largest  
8 projects they have ever seen for a single purpose. They're  
9 not talking about navigation dredging, we're talking about  
10 one big hole in a river or an estuary. This is six times  
11 that size at 4.3 million cubic yards, it's staggering. And  
12 the EIS dramatically understates the impact of that dredging  
13 and that excavation on the permanent ecological function of  
14 Coos Bay. The turbidity will be serious -- much more  
15 serious than disclosed in the EIS.

16 And lastly, you know, I want to get down to some  
17 of the huge omissions in this document. In Section 5 of the  
18 EIS, there are a bunch of recommendations for things that  
19 need to be studied. And there's a whole list of things that  
20 should be released to the public during this comment period.  
21 I would submit that things like the location of mainline  
22 block valves, mitigation plans, habitat mitigation plans for  
23 non-federal lands. Those things should have been part of  
24 this environmental impact statement to start with. They  
25 shouldn't be being produced and released to the public

PM4-59

PM4-60

**PM4**

**Continued, page 124 of 162**

PM4-59

The effects of turbidity on Coos Bay are addressed in Sections 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7 of the EIS.

PM4-60

Part of the reason for preparing a draft is to identify missing or unclear information for consideration in the FEIS. Also, some information cannot be obtained prior to the completion of the FEIS because the applicant does not have access to most private property, and cannot survey these areas. Therefore, not all information on the pipeline route would be known until and unless eminent domain is granted. Similarly, the state permits may require changes; these cannot be identified until the full route is surveyed and the facilities are designed.



125

PM4

Continued, page 125 of 162

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 midstream as the document is out for public comment.

2 So I would urge you to withdraw this EIS,

3 resubmit something more fully cooked and take public comment

4 at that time.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

6 MR. SERRES: Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ms. Hyde, then Barbara B, then Ed

9 Averal and then Bill Gowan.

10 MS. HYDE: Hi, my name is Liz Hyde, and that's

11 L-i-z H-y-d-e. And I am a landowner along with my siblings.

12 We own -- inherited a farm from our father who bought the

13 farm before going off to World War II. So we would like to

14 keep it in the family and pass it to our grandchildren. So

15 this pipeline goes the full length of our 200-and-some acre

16 farm. And on that farm is the Cokehill River and so the

17 pipeline which I can never hold my arms out to demonstrate

18 how big 36 inches is, but it's no small pipeline going

19 through our land and our river. And as we were growing up,

20 we did a lot of fishing in that river and our grandchildren

21 have also done some fishing there. And in the winter the

22 water would rise up to the bridge and then we would have to

23 go and tear away all the debris that would pile up, you

24 know, in case of a log jam.

25 So if this pipeline is sitting in the middle of

PM4-60  
confd

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

126

PM4

Continued, page 126 of 162

1 our river, which we were told it's going to be doing, they  
2 have no intention of trenching because it's a small  
3 tributary, we're concerned about how that's going to be  
4 handled and not to mention how it's going to be monitored in  
5 terms of gas leaks. And it's a timbered forest land. Part  
6 of it is timber, part of it is farmland. And we have very  
7 large concerns about how it's being shoved through. And, so  
8 we just ask that you pay close attention to how it's built,  
9 who is monitoring the leaks, and who is taking care of the  
10 upkeep on the pipeline itself.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: I do want to clarify, the pipeline  
15 will be trenched. It will be underground.

16 MS. HYDE: (Off microphone.) Well, we were told  
17 that initially, but then --

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm telling you as the person who  
19 will regulate this thing, it will be underground.

20 MS. HYDE: Thank you very much.

21 MS. BROWN: My name is Barbara Brown, B-r-o-w-n.  
22 I have horrible handwriting. B is the only thing legible.

23 First of all, I am one of her siblings, so we're  
24 talking about the same property. And -- but before I start  
25 talking, I want to ask a couple questions. There were

PM4-61

PM4-61

Comment noted.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

127

PM4

Continued, page 127 of 162

1 several people that talked about how this Pacific Connector  
2 pipeline is going to supply industrial users in Roseburg and  
3 Douglas County. And it was my understanding that there were  
4 no offshoots for pipeline service from the pipeline except  
5 for in Jordan Cove.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, if you heard my speech at the  
7 beginning, I mentioned an interconnect with Northwest  
8 Natural Grants Pass Lateral.

9 MS. BROWN: But that wouldn't be supplying  
10 Douglas County; would it?

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

12 MS. BROWN: Where?

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: The interconnect is in Douglas  
14 County.

15 MS. BROWN: Right. But there's no -- there's no  
16 lines to supply users --

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, that's not true. The Grants  
18 Pass Lateral connects to the local distribution companies.

19 MS. BROWN: Okay. So it will supply?

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, absolutely. The DEIS clearly  
21 states that.

22 MS. BROWN: Okay. I wanted to clarify that  
23 because that's not what my understanding was.

24 The other thing that I was questioning is when  
25 they talk about mitigation of the project, you know, like

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

128

1 environmental mitigation and everything, does that mean that  
2 they're actually going to go in and plant more trees and  
3 protect the land from erosion around where the pipe will  
4 cross the creek? Or does that mean that they'll buy  
5 mitigation credits that you can be, you know, purchased.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: My understanding is they're going  
7 to revegetate the right-of-way except for 30 feet over the  
8 pipeline which will be kept in a herbaceous state.

9 MS. BROWN: Okay. So there's two things that I  
10 want to say about what I read in the summary of the  
11 environmental impact statement. One says that there are no  
12 wells that are impacted that are not irrigation wells. So  
13 that there's no wells impacted for people's water source,  
14 private water source. And there is. Our neighbors well is  
15 within 50 feet of the pipeline and she's very concerned  
16 about, you know, her water quality.

17 So I guess we just take everything Pacific  
18 Connector says and or do we verify it or --

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, you read the DEIS which was  
20 written by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and our  
21 cooperating federal partners.

22 MS. BROWN: So if there's an error in it --

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's why it's called a draft.  
24 Sometimes they contain errors and we'd like to correct that  
25 in the final.

PM4-62

PM4-63

**PM4**

**Continued, page 128 of 162**

PM4-62

Mitigation will take many forms. The applicant will be required to restore disturbed areas and protect the areas from erosion (as specified in this comment). The applicant may also be required to pay into mitigation banks (e.g., as part of the compensatory wetland mitigation that may be required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the state agencies).

PM4-63

As stated on page 4-355 of the DEIS and in the Groundwater Supply Monitoring and Mitigation Plan, pre-construction surveys would be conducted to confirm the presence and locations of all groundwater supplies for landowners within and adjacent to the proposed pipeline right-of-way. Pacific Connector has stated that it would further verify exact locations of springs and seeps during easement negotiation with landowners.

As discussed in section 4.4.2.1, in its Groundwater Supply Monitoring and Mitigation Plan, Pacific Connector states that should it be determined after construction that there has been an effect to groundwater supply (either yield or quality), Pacific Connector would provide a temporary supply of water, and if determined necessary, would replace the affected supply with a permanent water supply. Mitigation measures would be coordinated with the individual landowner to meet the landowner's specific needs.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

129

1 MS. BROWN: Okay.  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: And that's why we have these  
3 meetings.  
4 MS. BROWN: Okay. Good. Okay. And the other --  
5 let's see -- I'm really bad at this business here. The  
6 other thing that I wanted to ask about here -- I have a lot  
7 of things, but I don't have time for --  
8 MR. FRIEDMAN: But you can always write a letter  
9 to the Commission and file electronic comments.  
10 MS. BROWN: Yes.  
11 Now, it says that when they cut the trees by the  
12 river, it won't hurt the -- shade won't hurt the fish  
13 habitat. But the Oregon Forest Practice Act says that it  
14 does. So how is that in compliance?  
15 MR. FRIEDMAN: We'll address that comment in the  
16 final EIS. Right now your time is up.  
17 MS. BROWN: Thank you.  
18 (Applause.)  
19 MR. FRIEDMAN: You're welcome.  
20 Ed Averill, then Bill Gow, and then Wyatt Warner,  
21 maybe.  
22 MR. AVERILL: Okay. My name is Ed Averill,  
23 spelled A-v-e-r-i-l-l. And the aspect I want to talk to on  
24 this is that this is a big engineering project.  
25 I trained as an engineer. Not in these fields,

PM4-64

**PM4**

**Continued, page 129 of 162**

PM4-64

The estimates of riparian clearing effects are addressed in section 4.6.2.3. The model of likely temperature changes indicates they would be slight. The applicant has proposed additional riparian plantings to offset any potential temperature increases. Additionally, the applicant will obtain permits designating what would be allowed relative to temperature in streams. See responses SA1-86, -96, -101, -106, and -107.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

130

PM4

Continued, page 130 of 162

1 but it was an engineer. And I was raised by an engineer. I  
2 was raised by a man who was the dean of engineering for 25  
3 years. And one of the things that he made a big point of  
4 drilling into me long before I ever even decided to be an  
5 engineer, what if there was a difference between a  
6 technician and a professional engineer. One of the things  
7 that a man takes on or a person takes on when he becomes an  
8 engineer is responsibility for the public. That's a part of  
9 the oath of becoming a professional engineer.

10 So on an engineering project, one that is  
11 performed by professional engineers has to be for the  
12 benefit of the public. And I know that there's a sentence  
13 in her that your Commission already has a responsibility to  
14 produce things that are for the benefit of the public.

15 But I would say that in this case, it is patently  
16 true that the climate issue is the issue. That whether we  
17 have here is a project that is increasing the expected use  
18 of fossil fuels dramatically. Even in the state of Oregon,  
19 the single power plant was intended to allow for the  
20 liquefaction of this fossil fuel that would be exported is a  
21 huge new use of fossil fuel in the state.

22 We're in a situation where the sixth extinction  
23 is coming if we don't do something about it. And that  
24 requires that we make a sudden turnaround and decrease in  
25 the use of fossil fuels. And there really is no other

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

131

1 choice.  
2 So this project cannot be seen as an ethical  
3 engineering project to approve and so I would describe this  
4 project as a cannon shot in the bow of the good ship human  
5 biosphere. And therefore I just can't see that it should be  
6 approved.  
7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
8 (Applause.)  
9 MR. GOW: Yeah, my name is Bill Gow, I'm a  
10 rancher from the local area here, affected land owner. My  
11 name is B-i-l-l G-o-w.  
12 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll go with you now, Bill.  
13 MR. GOW: That's part of the problem with this  
14 whole process after seven years. You guys have been a  
15 damned dog and pony show this whole time and you're owned by  
16 the industry. And that's the kind of comments that we're  
17 getting sick of. We make comments, we come up here, we try  
18 to -- we put our heart on the line, we stay up nights, we  
19 travel all over the place to put our comments into this  
20 process and you just throw them into garbage, I guess,  
21 because none of them ever get addressed. It's a damned dog  
22 and pony show by the industry. You're owned by the  
23 industry, and you're a puppet for the industry. Anyway,  
24 that's not where I wanted to go. So don't start running me  
25 down about what I do. Okay.

**PM4**

**Continued, page 131 of 162**

PM4-65

All comments on the DEIS have been reviewed and considered. This appendix to the FEIS includes all public comments received or postmarked within the official comment period, as well as FERC's responses.

PM4-65

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

132

PM4

Continued, page 132 of 162

1           That's part of the problem with this process. You  
2 think that this industry -- they own you.  
3           Okay. Anyway, let me get back to what I was  
4 going to talk about. There is -- you know, and I've been  
5 around this process long enough, Paul, to see even if the  
6 industry come in and change their own laws in the state of  
7 Oregon. House Bill 2700, people should be out in rage.  
8 House Bill 2700, there used to be my signature to take out  
9 permits on my property. And this damned industry went in  
10 there and changed the law so now they don't even need my  
11 permit -- my signature, my permission to take out a permit  
12 on my property. Can you imagine? That's the kind of  
13 industry we're dealing with people. Everybody thinks this  
14 is a hell of a deal.  
15           Okay. You know, another thing is, I'm still  
16 paying the taxes on this property. They're not going to pay  
17 my taxes once they take my land. I still pay them. And  
18 this is a gas transmission line. For your information, it  
19 raw natural gas, it's not treated gas. It can't go into  
20 that lateral without being treated. I don't know if you  
21 knew that. I don't know if you've ever read the EIS. But  
22 it's a pretty big deal. Okay.  
23           There is a -- this thing should be built on the  
24 backs of landowners. It's being built on the backs of  
25 landowners. I heard the people going last night, how



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

133

PM4

Continued, page 133 of 162

1 they're going to help the HUD people. Why don't they help  
2 the landowners? If this thing is such a good project and it  
3 could stand on its own, you guys shouldn't need imminent  
4 domain to make this project flow. You shouldn't need it.  
5 You shouldn't need it if it's such a great project.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. GOW: Okay. Why do you think -- why do you  
8 think the Canadians don't want it in Canada? Why do you  
9 think they found a sucker down here that they can run it  
10 through? Because the first nation and everybody else is not  
11 going to let them through in Canada. They're not going to  
12 let this project go into Canada. So they're trying to sneak  
13 in there and find some sucker, some hillbillies, or whatever  
14 they think they can run through and take advantage of them,  
15 and they can grab their land, take it for nothing, and --  
16 don't put that up because he's stole part of my time.

17 Okay. And, you know, a few years of jobs isn't  
18 worth the suffering of the rest of my life, okay, and my  
19 kids and my grandkids. I have a really nice ranch that I  
20 worked hard to put together. I gave my blood, sweat, and  
21 everything else to this and you guys might take my life, but  
22 you're not taking my freedom. Okay. I mean, that's a God  
23 damned promise. Okay.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. GOW: And I'll tell you what, there is -- if

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

134

1 you guys all think this is such a really great project and  
2 everything else, then you need to listen to this next  
3 gentleman that speaks, because he's actually lived there.  
4 You guys are just sucking off the tip. You listen to these  
5 people that are actually getting affected by this and you'll  
6 find out this next guy, Wyatt Warren, you just listen to his  
7 testimony what this guy has been through.

8 And, you know, this whole process has just been a  
9 -- we've spent lots of nights, lots of time, you're getting  
10 paid, we're not. We come here every damned night to try --  
11 and you don't even have the respect for us to put our  
12 comments in the EIS. You never put any -- I've come here  
13 and give scoping comments. I've gave everything else and  
14 none of it's ever been addressed.

15 And all it's addressed with is a blanket  
16 statement. And you didn't write this. The federal  
17 government didn't write this EIS. The industry gave you the  
18 information to put in this.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. GOW: You know, you know that.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your time.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next, are you Wyatt?

25 MR. WANNER: I am.

**PM4**

**Continued, page 134 of 162**

PM4-66

All comments on the DEIS have been reviewed and considered. This appendix to the FEIS includes all public comments received or postmarked within the official comment period, as well as FERC's responses.

PM4-67

The EIS was prepared by the NEPA cooperating agencies (which include the FERC, BLM, Forest Service, Coast Guard, FWS, COE, EPA, as well as others) and their contractors.

PM4-66

PM4-67

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

135

PM4

Continued, page 135 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Your handwriting is  
2 difficult to read. All right. After Wyatt I have Steve  
3 Cheseborough, Ann Camberlain, Michael Gannon, and Annie  
4 Ocean.  
5 MR. WANNER: Wyatt Wanner, W-a-n-n-e-r. I'm the  
6 only guy in the room so far who actually lives with gas  
7 lines. Not one, I have three. This is not fun. My family  
8 farm is almost a century farm. My neighbor's farm is. They  
9 had a gas leak on their property. It took them two years to  
10 find it. The guys didn't show up until after the wind was  
11 blowing. The wind blows the gas away, they couldn't find  
12 it. They finally hit it right on a still day and then they  
13 found it. Okay.  
14 Eminent domain. In the face of eminent domain,  
15 you don't own the land, you only rent it. They're not just  
16 taking an easement, they're taking the right to go across  
17 your property anywhere they so feel.  
18 The union members back there, I respect you  
19 greatly. Okay. I've seen you guys working on the line.  
20 I've watched it twice. Okay. You do a good job, you clean  
21 up after yourselves, but I've heard complaints that the  
22 pipeline comes from China.  
23 The guys that I've met working on the line, most  
24 of which were not locals. The welders welding asked me to  
25 go away because I was videotaping them. They're down in a

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

136

PM4

Continued, page 136 of 162

1 ten-foot deep trench. There's no shoring. It doesn't get  
2 any better.  
3 BLM Forest Service, lucky you. You get to make  
4 them play your games. Once they're outside of your domain,  
5 then we have to play their games. All I can do is beg for  
6 whatever they're willing to negotiate to me. I don't get to  
7 say no.  
8 The FERC's statement for the Northwest Natural  
9 Gas Line requires that pipelines do not parallel or go  
10 underneath in parallel with fence lines. I'm happy to say  
11 that's a lie on my property. The gas line invited me to put  
12 the fence line back in. There was a dispute about the  
13 property line. It's been the property line since my father  
14 was a child. That's where it was, that's where it will be.  
15 It turns out that fence line is right over the pipe. They  
16 even offered to hire me to put it in. It's a game of  
17 liability. No. I know what you're playing at. If anything  
18 ever happens, I will not be responsible. The depth of the  
19 pipe happens to be deep enough in that spot, I'm not too  
20 worried about it. Depth of pipe on your property is key.  
21 It affects what you can do, it affects how it goes across  
22 your property. The reason you don't have any maps is  
23 because they don't know exactly where they're going to put  
24 it. When the hoe driver, all of which were foreigners from  
25 Oregon, find something they will decide whether they're

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

137

PM4

Continued, page 137 of 162

1 going to go around it, through it, or whatever. So there is  
2 no necessarily planning. The little pink ribbons on the  
3 stakes are only a guide. They will fill in the blanks  
4 later.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: And, Wyatt, if you have more  
7 comments, you may file them in written format at the FERC.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Steve Cheseborough.

10 MR. CHESEBOROUGH: Hi, I'm Steve Cheseborough,  
11 C-h-e-s-e-b-o-r-o-u-g-h. Thank you for inviting us here to  
12 speak about this. I just wanted to make a couple point  
13 about the testimony itself that we've heard here. Of  
14 course, most of the speakers have been opposed to this  
15 project. But the ones who are in favor of it have what I  
16 would call a conflict of interest. They mostly are going to  
17 make money on the project in some way. And usually people  
18 with a conflict of interest should excuse themselves from  
19 speaking about the subject. And if they don't understand  
20 it, then I think you should take anything they say with a  
21 grain of salt.

22 Okay. Whereas, the people who came here to  
23 oppose the project all are here on their own time, own  
24 money. No one is paying any of us to be here to speak  
25 against this. And pretty much everyone who is speaking

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

138

PM4

Continued, page 138 of 162

1 against it is speaking from public interest, talking about  
2 human safety and long-term health of animals and environment  
3 and the planet. So that's kind of, you know, pretty clearly  
4 public interest with logic and science on our side, not just  
5 wanting to make a living. I mean, of course, everyone wants  
6 to make a living, but that is clearly not of public  
7 interest.

8 The only other arguments I've heard in favor of  
9 the project are the Chamber of Commerce people who are  
10 saying that they want to have more natural gas for the local  
11 businesses, then this would help them with that. But I  
12 don't think you run -- like divert a river through your  
13 house to water the house plants. You know, that would kind  
14 of be -- you know, what -- if they need more gas for local  
15 businesses, then they could make some small pipeline that  
16 would fulfill that need. They don't really need an enormous  
17 and dangerous pipeline where 99.99 percent of it is going to  
18 be shipped somewhere else just for local businesses.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ann Chamberlain, Michael Gannon,  
23 Annie Ocean, Renee Colt.

24 MS. CHAMBERLAIN: Anne Chamberlain,  
25 C-h-a-m-b-e-r-l-a-i-n. I am one of those. I'm not

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

139

PM4

Continued, page 139 of 162

1 originally from Oregon. Actually, I come from New Jersey.  
2 Guess why I left New Jersey? Air pollution, polluted water,  
3 rising seas. My property was on the shore. I have seen  
4 water in my lifetime come up a good foot and you tell me  
5 that that's not going to happen if we continue the path  
6 we're taking.

7 I started out life as a biologist. I know a  
8 great deal. I have been in the forest many, many times. I  
9 eventually ended up as an environmental chemist. What was  
10 my specialty? Water pollution, air pollution. I know a lot  
11 about these things. I wanted to just comment on the edge  
12 which was something I meant to talk about.

13 Cutting this swath through the forest, I did a  
14 quick estimate, I can still do math without a calculator,  
15 amazingly, isn't it? Okay. We would create two trillion,  
16 650,320 feet of edge with this project. That is so  
17 detrimental to wildlife, you cannot begin to imagine.

18 Barred owls, oh, boy they love edge. That's  
19 their favorite hunting ground. This threatens the spotted  
20 owl more than anything else.

21 We have one trillion, 130 -- I'm sorry, 132  
22 trillion, 516,000 square feet of bare land that's going to  
23 be treated with herbicides, pesticides as they are fond of  
24 saying. This is a really great idea for water quality. I  
25 like that.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

140

1           Okay. Then we get to eminent domain. Kilover is  
2   a city of New London. I'm going to pretend to be a lawyer  
3   now, my brother is, he put me onto this. Okay. The U.S.  
4   Supreme Court, the governmental taking of property for one  
5   private owner to give to another in furtherance of economic  
6   development constitutes permissible public use under the  
7   fifth amendment. That was a five to four decision. It was  
8   not a happy one.

9           The principal dissent, Justice O'Connor. Any  
10   property may now be taken for the benefit of another private  
11   party, but the fallout from this decision will not be  
12   random. The beneficiaries are like to be those citizens  
13   with disproportionate influence and power in the political  
14   process including large corporations.

15           Justice Thomas added, "Something has gone  
16   seriously awry with this court's interpretation of the  
17   Constitution. Those citizens are safe from the government  
18   in their homes. The homes themselves are not" and that is  
19   what is happening here.

20           He went on to say, "Allowing the government" --

21           MR. FRIEDMAN: Ann, you're going to wrap up now;  
22   right?

23           MS. CHAMBERLAIN: I am wrapping up. "Allowing  
24   the government to take property solely for public purposes  
25   is bad enough, but extending the concept of public purpose

PM4-68

## PM4

## Continued, page 140 of 162

PM4-68

The U.S. Congress decided to convey the power of eminent domain to private companies that receive a Certificate from the FERC when it passed section 7(h) of the NGA in 1947. The Commission would make its decision on public benefit in its Project Order. The Commission would issue its Order after we have produced an FEIS. Environmental Justice is addressed in section 4.9.



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

141

PM4

Continued, page 141 of 162

1 to encompass any economically beneficial goal guarantees  
2 that these losses will fall disproportionately on poor  
3 communities."

PM4-68  
conf'd

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your time.

5 MS. CHAMBERLAIN: That's what we are.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Michael Gannon.

8 MR. GANNON: Hi, I'm Michael Gannon, G-a-n-n-o-n.

9 I've heard some wonderful stuff about this pipeline and it's  
10 problems. So I'm going to try to be creatively short  
11 tonight. Louder.

12 One of the things I think a lot of people have  
13 touched on, but maybe not in a way that requires the depth  
14 of thought to consider is the mental images that we carry  
15 from having grown up along this territory that will be  
16 covered by the pipeline.

17 I got my forestry merit badge in one of the  
18 forests that you're going to cut through. I learned to  
19 water ski on a lake that drains off the watershed covered by  
20 the pipeline. I remember camping with my scout troop in an  
21 area that is crossed by the pipeline and we played a game at  
22 night as we were trying to sleep and we listened for wolves  
23 and we talked about whether or not the sounds we heard were  
24 wolves.

25 OR7 protected by the federal government lives

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

142

PM4

Continued, page 142 of 162

1 along the proposed route of the pipeline with his new cubs  
2 from this year. And I think most of the people who live in  
3 this area have really wonderful memories of what it used to  
4 be like and how beautiful it is today to them. And  
5 everything that we heard today imperils that memory and  
6 forecasts a great cloud upon the likelihood that our  
7 offspring will enjoy the really extraordinary life in  
8 southwest Oregon over the last maybe 150 years since se  
9 started to, quote, "settle it" and take it away from native  
10 Americans.

11 So it's really hard to figure out how to talk  
12 about these feelings and ideas in such a way that people  
13 back in D.C. reading the impact statement will really be  
14 able to measure them and that's what we're struggling with  
15 today, is to measure these in ways that will make sense to  
16 people who would actually spend the money to endanger our  
17 lifestyle to the extent which is being proposed here.

18 Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

21 Next is Annie Ocean and Renee Cote then M. A.  
22 Hanson, and then absolutely illegible.

23 MS. OCEAN: Annie Ocean, O-c-e-a-n. I'm a native  
24 Oregonian, 65 years. And 40 years ago we bought the Oregon  
25 Women's Land Trust and our farm, Woods Creek Road outside of

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

143

PM4

Continued, page 143 of 162

1 Days Creek. And the land was paid for by women all over the  
2 world. It is a sanctuary for women, any woman to come and  
3 live who needs a place to be. And now a pipeline is going  
4 to be going through it if it's allowed. I'm begging you to  
5 not allow it.

6 I've been a laborer for 53 years. Seems to have  
7 some credibility here today, saying you're a laborer, 53  
8 years a laborer in Oregon.

9 There's a glut right now of oil and gas. This is  
10 why oil prices at the pump are low. China, Russia, and  
11 Brazil, their economy have not grown as projected. I've  
12 also read that China and Russia want to use their own fuels.  
13 They don't want ours. Why should they buy ours when they  
14 have their own?

15 Fossil fuel is over. Think about it. It's over.  
16 (Applause.)

17 MS. OCEAN: It's dirty, it's greedy, and it can be  
18 metered. That's the only reason why we don't have clean  
19 fuels is because these fossil fuels can be metered so that  
20 the 1 percent can have more money. There is so much energy  
21 out there for us to have that's free. And that's where we  
22 need to be thinking about and going, not staying with the  
23 dirty fuels. They are truly over.

24 And, also, this way of thinking is over. Think  
25 about it. Think about the kids that are growing up now.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

144

PM4

Continued, page 144 of 162

1 I'm really speaking for my descendents, the descendents of  
2 the planet, not my bloodline, but the descendents of the  
3 planet.

4 In 2013 and 2014, the polar ice caps have melted  
5 faster than any other years put together, and it's  
6 increasing. This isn't said lightly, this is like huge.  
7 This leaves us with the probability that unbelievably in 20  
8 years we won't be here. That's 20 years. Take it in. I  
9 mean, really, seriously, take it in. Should we take this  
10 step with fossil fuels? Hell no. It's ludicrous,  
11 absolutely ludicrous.

12 And drilling under our rivers, you know, I  
13 haven't heard a lot about LNG, but when I did hear that  
14 we're going to be drilling under our rivers, the rivers that  
15 are so beautiful, so clean, we need clean energy right now.  
16 The impact on our environment is way past sustainability.  
17 We'll be lucky if the human race lives another 20 years.

18 Right now the release of methane is so rapid it's  
19 staggering. I suggest we refrain from this project which is  
20 so old, old way of thinking. Believe it, jobs are not as  
21 important as our staying alive, our environment is in a  
22 state of emergency, truly.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

25 Renee Cote.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

145

PM4

Continued, page 145 of 162

1 Ms. COTE: My name is -- my name is Renee Cote,  
2 R-e-n-e-e C-o-t-e. I'm also speaking for the Oregon Women's  
3 Land Trust, for the land which has about 139 acres. We are  
4 completely opposed to the LNG pipeline. If this pipeline  
5 goes through, it will destroy the mission and the purpose of  
6 our women's land. It will destroy the peace and quiet of  
7 the land. It will not be a safe place anymore. The  
8 pipeline could explode, it will be a danger on the land. It  
9 is a risk for earthquakes, it is destructive for the  
10 wildlife. It is a disaster to the climate, and I could go  
11 on and on. It's bad news.  
12 Now, I'm Canadian. You hear my accent, and I  
13 know that this Canadian corporation is a greedy Canadian  
14 corporation and we should just wake up. And the other thing  
15 that's been mentioned, the San Bruno pipeline explosion in  
16 California. I have lived in California. That happened  
17 September 9th, 2010. It could happen here also.  
18 The project is more destruction for the planet.  
19 (Applause.)  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
21 M. A. Hanson.  
22 And the person who followed Ms. Hanson wrote  
23 their name in script that I can't read. And so if you know  
24 if you signed this after Ms. Hanson, can you please come up  
25 to speak?

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

146

PM4

Continued, page 146 of 162

1 MS. HANSON: Am I on?  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.  
3 MS. HANSON: Oh.  
4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Just pull it out. Just pull the  
5 microphone out. There you go.  
6 MS. HANSON: I really don't want to hold -- Okay.  
7 I am Ms. M. A. Hanson. I am also a boondocker from Douglas  
8 County. I got this title from the lawyer of the Pacific  
9 Connector. He stated in one of our meetings that us people  
10 -- we people live in the boondocks and so they can't get to  
11 us for three hours to help us if anything happens because  
12 you all live in the boondocks. And that's exactly what he  
13 said. And I thought, *hmm*, I'm rather proud to be a  
14 boondocker, thank you very much. I didn't believe them all  
15 the years that they told us that they would be there to help  
16 us within an hour. We live in this country, we know how  
17 long it takes to get there. I'm asking why in the hell are  
18 you building this thing in our boondocks? And actually  
19 you're not going to build it because we won't let you.  
20 (Applause.)  
21 MS. HANSON: I just want to answer a few things  
22 that I heard today. Number one, LNG is definitely not a  
23 bridge energy. First of all, I don't know where we're all  
24 getting our information, but all of us here have the  
25 information and we've had it for years, even when they were

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

147

PM4

Continued, page 147 of 162

1 going to export/import, what the heck ever they're going to  
2 do, we were told all along we get none of this energy. One  
3 reason why we can't smell it. So somebody please get that  
4 straight. Because we are not trusting anybody anymore. I  
5 personally have been fighting this thing for over seven  
6 years day and night. It's not going to cross -- I own 100  
7 acres, and it's not going to cross my 100 acres. And I own  
8 a house in town, it's not going near that.

9 I am a concerned citizen which brings another  
10 point to mind. I keep hearing about if you can satisfy the  
11 landowners, you got a hell of a lot more to satisfy than  
12 landowners. You got me to satisfy. I'm not a landowner  
13 that is right personally affected. I'm a citizen that's  
14 affected. This is affecting every citizen in that is world.  
15 This is going to throw us on the world market. When you  
16 throw the United States on the world market for natural gas,  
17 that's saying something. It's affecting the world.

18 I have hardly started. The past project manager  
19 told me when I asked the question, how many Oregonians are  
20 going to be employed on this pipeline, this was the other  
21 pipeline, the one they lied about to us for years. We knew  
22 all along that they were going to export instead of import.  
23 I accused them of it seven years ago. They told me that's  
24 the stupidest thing we ever heard of, we would never do that  
25 because there's -- because we need gas.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

148

PM4

Continued, page 148 of 162

1           So now all of a sudden everything has changed.  
2   We've known all along that they were lying to us. Why  
3   should we at all trust them? Anyway, that was an awful -- I  
4   was wondering if I could fill that time, I guess I can.  
5           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.  
6           (Applause.)  
7           MR. FRIEDMAN: So who signed up after Ms. Hansen?  
8   I can't read it.  
9           MS. JOHNSON: Hello, my name is Naomi Johnson.  
10   N-a-o-m-i J-o-h-n-s-o-n. My mailing address is P.O. Box  
11   915, Crestwell, Oregon 97426.  
12           I would like to thank you the Federal Energy  
13   Regulation Committee and its esteemed panel members for the  
14   due diligence and their patience during the public comment  
15   period as well as the Umpqua Community College for this  
16   forum. I would like the record to reflect that I asked that  
17   there would not be a delay in the FERC IES decision, excuse  
18   me.  
19           It's been a while since I public spoke.  
20           I ask that you authorize the construction and  
21   operation of the Jordan Cove LNG plan and the Pacific  
22   Connector pipeline. I am a proud union member at the  
23   Laborers Local 121, a daughter of a veteran, as well as a  
24   daughter of a retired Local 3 member.  
25           As a union laborer I am extensively trained and

PM4-69

Comment noted.

PM4-69



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

149

PM4

Continued, page 149 of 162

1 qualified and certified in numerous construction activities.  
2 Pipeline construction as a specialty in right-of-way,  
3 blasting activities, and environmental protection and  
4 restoration. As a trained and certified pipeline worker, I  
5 know and participate and it is in the foremost of the gas  
6 company's first is to construct and protect the environment  
7 with state-of-the-art materials and procedures from the 21st  
8 century, not the 20th.

9 It will be constructed, if permitted, with highly  
10 skilled and certified union hands from all the craft trades.  
11 It is in the public's interest to construct and operate the  
12 Jordan Cove LNG plant and Pacific Connector pipeline. It's  
13 our turn, it's our time to boost the state of Oregon's  
14 economy, the strength -- strengthen the job sector that  
15 southwest Oregon so desperately needs.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: John Schofield, Ted Gleichman,  
20 Richard Chasm, Alex Les -- Alex somebody.

21 PARTICIPANT: (Off microphone.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is John Schofield here? That's a  
23 yes or a no.

24 Is Ted Gleichman here? All right. So, Ted,  
25 you're next because I didn't see John Schofield show up.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

150

PM4

Continued, page 150 of 162

1 MR. GLEICHMAN: Thank you. Good evening. I am  
2 Ted Gleichman, G-l-e-i-c-h-m-a-n. That's the same spelling  
3 as last night.

4 And it's an honor to be spending so much time  
5 with you folks this week together I think will be a special  
6 time for all of us.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. GLEICHMAN: You will recall that last night I  
9 focused on the jobs issue. I'm here representing Sierra  
10 Club and made the point then that the jobs that would  
11 contribute to climate destabilization and destruction of a  
12 livable climate and atmosphere are not good jobs. Good jobs  
13 that we need are those that deal on the coast and inland  
14 with earthquake and tsunami remediation, and infrastructure  
15 protection and building programs.

16 I'd like to make a couple of points tonight and,  
17 of course, solar energy jobs, renewable energy jobs. Good,  
18 long-term, permanent jobs.

19 I'd like to make a couple of points tonight. Mr.  
20 Friedman, you made a comment in your introduction about the  
21 U.S. DOE approval of Jordan Cove's application for export to  
22 corporate trade partners of the United States and  
23 non-corporate trade partners to the United States. I think  
24 an important clarification to that is that this DOE approval  
25 for the non-corporate trade partners, partners who do not

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

151

1 yet have a formal so-called free trade agreement with the  
2 United States is a conditional approval. Which actually  
3 bolsters the point that you like to make frequently that  
4 this is not a done deal. The Federal --  
5 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.  
6 MR. GLEICHMAN: -- the Federal Energy Regulatory  
7 Commission has not ruled yet, and we understand that there  
8 are very many important issues still to be discussed, to be  
9 determined, quite possibly to be litigated before this  
10 determination can be made.  
11 One of the interesting things that's happened  
12 this evening was the discussion of cumulative impacts. And  
13 I submit for your consideration that FERC is in some ways in  
14 violation of its own standards on cumulative impacts. I  
15 would refer you to page 4-1001 of the draft EIS for the  
16 sentence from the 1997 Council on Environmental Quality  
17 Standards, "CEQ recommends setting the geographic scope  
18 based on the natural boundaries of the resource affected  
19 rather than jurisdictional boundaries." It's clear -- you  
20 spoke to climate issues, and I'll touch on those another  
21 time over the rest of the week. It's clear that the natural  
22 boundaries of the resource affected are the boundaries of  
23 the planet. The scope has been improperly defined for the  
24 draft EIS.  
25 Thank you.

PM4-70

## PM4

## Continued, page 151 of 162

### PM4-70

The introduction to section 4.14 explains how the analysis areas were identified. It appears the comment suggests that since the entire climate is connected, we need to consider cumulative effects of all projects that affect the world's climate. This is clearly beyond the scope of this analysis. Even if we could estimate the carbon emitted where the gas is burned, subtract the carbon that we guess would not be emitted by burning other fuels, add the carbon released in transport then subtract the carbon emitted during mining and transport of other fuels, then estimate the carbon that would be emitted in building the trucks, mining equipment and ships, the trucks and trains that transported the materials to the factories assembly points and ports, these things would only be a small part of the story. There is also the carbon emitted by food production needed to feed the workers, fertilizer needed to produce the food, transportation emissions needed to produce the food and then transport it to market, and thousands of other variables. If we did try to do this analysis, we doubt anyone would agree that it was done correctly or that we included all factors.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

152

PM4

Continued, page 152 of 162

1 (Applause.)  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.  
3 Alex, before you we have Richard Chasm, and I  
4 think I saw Richard.  
5 MR. CHASM: Good evening, Richard Chasm, that's  
6 R-i-c-h-a-r-d C-h-a-s-m. First of all, I would really like  
7 a clarification because throughout this whole discussion, my  
8 understanding was that this gas was raw gas and that it  
9 would not be used for any processes until it reached Coos  
10 Bay and was cracked as part of the process of creating LNG.  
11 Any gas that would be used locally would be transferred back  
12 in the existing 12-inch pipeline that was reached through a  
13 couple years ago. Am I mistaken in that?  
14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah, I think -- and the EIS says  
15 this, so it's not a big secret here. But they're getting  
16 the gas from TransCanada and Ruby.  
17 MR. CHASM: Right.  
18 MR. FRIEDMAN: And other users from those  
19 pipelines currently use that gas. So it's usable in the  
20 local distribution systems. So Pacific Connector will have  
21 to take a little bit of that gas along the way going to Coos  
22 Bay at the Clarks Branch Meter Station --  
23 MR. CHASM: Right.  
24 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- and give that to the Williams  
25 Grant Pass Lateral and they can go to the local distribution

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

153

PM4

Continued, page 153 of 162

1 companies from there.

2 MR. CHASM: Okay.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: It doesn't have to be treated. It  
4 has to be treated at the liquefaction plant because of the  
5 way they freeze gas to make LNG.

6 MR. CHASM: The comments that I wanted to make  
7 tonight are, again, I'm sorry that Alex Palm, Alex Campbell  
8 and Perry Murray have left. No one opposed to this has ever  
9 suggested that the crafts people, the union people wouldn't  
10 do anything but a superlative job. They are professionals,  
11 they know what they're doing, they will do their best. We  
12 have never suggested anything but.

13 The real issue though is -- and I hope that the  
14 representatives of the Bureau of Land Management and Forest  
15 Service listen carefully. The real issue, in my mind, and  
16 this is insulting, is that the applicant wants to use the  
17 lowest standards of pipe thickness and quality and welding  
18 standards. And I've talked to a number of welders who've  
19 said, that's a very, very big deal. And there's a big  
20 difference in pipe grade. And there's a big difference in  
21 the welds.

22 Now, the craftsmen, the workers that are doing  
23 the welding have got pressure from the people who are  
24 spending the money, because they want to cut -- the want to  
25 put this in as cheaply as they possibly can to not do the

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

154

PM4

Continued, page 154 of 162

1 quality of welding that would be in the higher standards  
2 because we don't have a lot of people here.  
3 Well, as one of the people here, I resent being  
4 expendable. And we -- and this is why I'm sorry that the  
5 Chamber of Commerce people went, is because our economy is  
6 hooked into the timber industry and the harvest of our  
7 timber. And we just saw down here in the Douglas Complex  
8 fire what happens when a wildfire gets started and burns.  
9 What's going to happen when one of these fires burns to a  
10 crack in a defective pipe? And it's a checkerboard and it  
11 will burn through everybody's property. And Williams  
12 pipeline is thinking about their money not about our  
13 long-term timberland.

14 Finally, the landowners, when this is built and  
15 they were forced to sell timber, it's going to depress the  
16 price of logs. And the landowners then are forced to sell  
17 their timber when the price is down. And it's a  
18 manipulation by the company that they're unaware of because  
19 they don't have timber and they don't care. They want to  
20 put this in as cheaply as possible. The economic harm is  
21 profound and long-term and it affects a lot more than just  
22 the people.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Richard.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Alex, now it's your turn.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

155

1 MR. LOZNAK: Thank you, folks. My name is  
2 Alexander Loznak. That's A-l-e-x-a-n-d-e-r L-o-z-n-a-k.  
3 I'm 17 years old and I'm a senior at Roseburg High School.  
4 And I'm here representing the League of Umpqua Climate Youth  
5 or LUCY which is affiliated with Umpqua Watersheds. And I'm  
6 here to speak in opposition to the pipeline.

7 Now, you know, basically it seems like the draft  
8 environmental impact statement says that there's no real  
9 significant environmental impact from this project. But  
10 that is clearly, clearly false because when you look at the  
11 Jordan Cove energy project and not even considering the  
12 emissions from burning the LNG, just the emissions from the  
13 power plant, you know, at the site, at Jordan Cove, it could  
14 be the largest source of carbon emissions in Oregon.

15 Now, one day, not too far in the future, but when  
16 our coastlines are flooded by sea level rise and our  
17 landscapes have been destroyed by fires and droughts, your  
18 children -- your children will look to you and they will ask  
19 you, did you do everything you could? Did you do everything  
20 you could to keep global warming pollution in the ground?

21 Now, if you approve this project, you will have  
22 to look them in the eye and say, no, we failed you. Can you  
23 really live with that? I ask you, can you live with that?

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. LOZNAK: Now, folks, I'm here speaking to you

PM4-71

PM4

Continued, page 155 of 162

PM4-71

The EIS discussion includes both the GHG emissions and the relevant context. Section 4.12.1.4 has been updated to more clearly state the point about how natural gas is a lower-carbon fuel than many other fuel sources currently in use.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

156

PM4

Continued, page 156 of 162

1 as a child, but you're adults, so grow up, deny this  
2 project.

3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

6 Jane Mara, Gary Jackson, and Katrina Keller. Is  
7 Jane Mara, Gary Jackson, Katrina Keller, are those people  
8 here?

9 MS. MARA: So, can you hear me? I don't know if  
10 you all wake up in the morning and say to yourselves, we may  
11 be going extinct. I mean, this is amazing, to be a species  
12 that could be going extinct. I mean, it's really amazing  
13 and a lot of times really horrifying. So, I think -- I  
14 mean, a lot of people have said what I would say, but I  
15 think that one of the things that hasn't been said that is  
16 just so horrifying in the heart is all the effects that we  
17 are seeing today of climate change, they are from 40 years  
18 ago. They are from what we did 40 years ago. Because there  
19 is a 40-year time lag with climate change. So if we stopped  
20 every carbon emission into the world today, we still have 40  
21 years to catch up with.

22 Now, I don't know how old your kids are, or your  
23 grand kids, but that's a lot already in process. So, when  
24 Annie said, this is over, it may not be over today, but it's  
25 going to be over really soon because I think people are



20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

157

PM4

Continued, page 157 of 162

1 getting it. And these kinds of projects will not even come  
2 to the surface. So it's really already way long ago enough.  
3 And I just -- I just think it doesn't make any sense  
4 whatsoever, it's totally crazy to think about putting  
5 anymore anything into the air or into the soil or into the  
6 sea. So that's my basic point. Let me see if there was  
7 anything else I wanted to say. I don't have a little yellow  
8 card yet.

9 Well, I did want to -- I'll say one other thing  
10 is that, you know, we're in the middle, I think you know  
11 this, of the sixth great extinction. There have been five  
12 great extinctions on this planet. And in one of them 95  
13 percent of the life died, 95 percent. We're in the middle  
14 already of the sixth great extinction. Whether humans go  
15 extinct or not is not known. I mean, Annie quoted the  
16 20-year and I've certainly heard some other people quote 20,  
17 25, 30 years. Whether their science is completely accurate,  
18 I don't know. But there's a good likelihood we will go  
19 extinct, even if we stopped right now. Even if we stopped  
20 right now.

21 So I just think, you know, the whole grand --  
22 what the person before me said was what I was really going  
23 to say. Just think about your grandchildren, think about  
24 your children. Think about leaving a planet for them. Jobs  
25 aren't any good without a planet.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

158

PM4

Continued, page 158 of 162

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
2 (Applause.)  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: The next speaker is Gary Jackson.  
4 MR. JACKSON: Good evening. I'm Gary Jackson,  
5 I'm a member of the laborers local 296 in southern Oregon.  
6 I am the business manager there or business agent for there.  
7 But not only am I a laborer, I am also a member of the local  
8 Indian tribe. And I've heard a lot of references and stuff  
9 tonight about Native Americans. But I just wanted -- but I  
10 wanted to let you know that I am not speaking on behalf of  
11 our tribe tonight. The large part of this pipeline is going  
12 through the Calcreek ancestral grounds. I don't want FERC  
13 to think that all Indian tribes are opposed to this thing,  
14 because I've been kind of thinking that you might be getting  
15 that idea.  
16 And like I told you, I'm not --  
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gary, I've met with the tribal  
18 counsel.  
19 MR. JACKSON: Pardon?  
20 MR. FRIEDMAN: I've met with the counsel of the  
21 tribe.  
22 MR. JACKSON: Okay. I'm just letting you know  
23 though. I'm not speaking on behalf of the tribe. But at  
24 this time the Calcreeks have not taken a position on this  
25 pipeline. Okay. I just want that to be clear.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

159

PM4

Continued, page 159 of 162

1           Also, this pipeline is going through some of the  
2   most economically depressed areas in the state, these four  
3   different counties. And the Unions are trying to figure out  
4   a way to put a lot of people to work, not just our laborers  
5   that are in those unions right now, but also the local  
6   populations so this thing can truly be feasible for these  
7   local people to go to work for.

8           And there is also provisions for other industries  
9   to tap into this pipeline so they can use this gas to create  
10   other jobs that are also going to be putting all those local  
11   people to work. So it's not jus a one-sided thing where the  
12   Canadians are getting all the money out of this and we're  
13   getting nothing. We just have to get on the bandwagon and  
14   take care of our own business.

15           Thank you.

16           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

17           (Applause.)

18           MR. FRIEDMAN: The last speaker tonight is  
19   Katrina Keleher.

20           (Applause.)

21           MS. KELEHER: I'm really short. I'm Katrina  
22   Keleher. K-a-t-r-i-n-a K-e-l-e-h-e-r. And I would like to  
23   start, I would like to respectfully dispute a statement that  
24   someone said, made on record about two hours ago saying that  
25   climate change is a global problem, but not a local problem.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

160

PM4

Continued, page 160 of 162

1 Let me be very clear when I say that climate change is in  
2 fact a local crisis as well as a global one.  
3 My clarifying statement is based on scientific  
4 facts and sound logic rather than a non-expert opinion. I'm  
5 speaking as a recent geology and climate change studies  
6 college graduate, a U.S. citizen, an environmentalist and  
7 perhaps most importantly, as a concerned young woman.  
8 The nature of climate change is perhaps the  
9 worlds most disturbing global issue because we know that  
10 it's happening and we know why it is happening, and yet we  
11 are still choosing to develop and invest our time resources,  
12 and brain power into dangerous greenhouse gas emitting  
13 projects like the LNG pipeline.  
14 It is human nature to think in the short term.  
15 This project will create jobs, albeit temporary ones. It  
16 will create money and it will allow precious energy to  
17 become transported and available.  
18 Humans need to be thinking in the long term in  
19 regards to energy policies. The LNG pipeline will release  
20 methane into the atmosphere, it will amplify the warming  
21 effects of climate change, and it will serve as a breach in  
22 Oregonians' health and safety security. It will disrupt the  
23 biological and ecological diversity across our state, and it  
24 will serve as a distraction for perfecting longer-term  
25 energy solutions.

---

PM4 Continued, page 161 of 162

---

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015 161

1 Natural gas can indeed geologically be extracted  
2 safely from the ground, but the fact of the matter is that  
3 it simply is not safely being extracted and it will continue  
4 to be unsafe due to the grand scales at which our global  
5 society requires it. We need to be redirecting our focus  
6 towards clean and renewable energy. We have the resources.  
7 We have the technology, and we absolutely have the need.  
8 Let us stop wasting our time and being scientifically and  
9 economically naive.

10 As global climate change is no longer a  
11 hypothetical and it is no longer a minor threat. We need to  
12 act on the urgent global climate crisis immediately. We  
13 cannot keep wasting our time trying to figure out precisely  
14 when the pressurized, liquefied, natural gas pipeline will  
15 amplify global warming, because frankly the discussion we  
16 should be having is not about if that LNG pipeline will harm  
17 our global environment, but it is about when it's going to  
18 do that.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

22 MS. KELEHER: Thank you.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: With Katrina, we've reached the  
24 end of the speakers list and that means that this meeting is  
25 coming to a close.

20150113-4003 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

162

**PM4**

**Continued, page 80 of 162**

1           On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
2 Commission and our federal cooperating agency partners, I  
3 would like to thank you all for coming tonight and providing  
4 us with your comments on the DEIS for the Jordan Cove  
5 Pacific Connector project.

6           Let the record show that this meeting ended at  
7 10:00 p.m. Thank you.

8           (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the meeting was  
9 adjourned.)

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1

PM5

PM5

Public Meeting, Canyonville, OR, December 10, 2015

1                               BEFORE THE  
2                               FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
3       - - - - - X  
4   IN THE MATTER OF:                               : Project No.  
5   JORDAN COVE - PACIFIC CONNECTOR               : CP13-483-000  
6   PIPELINE PROJECT                               : CP13-492-000  
7       - - - - - X  
8  
9                               Seven Feathers Casino Resort  
10                               146 Chief Milwaleta  
11                               Canyonville, OR 97417  
12  
13                               Wednesday, December 10, 2014  
14       The above-entitled matter came on for technical  
15   conference, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Paul Friedman,  
16   the moderator.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PM5

Continued, page 2 of 115

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

2

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. FRIEDMAN: The Federal Energy Regulatory --  
3 you probably want to quiet down so you have an opportunity  
4 to hear everyone and what they have to say.  
5 We're going to use some abbreviations tonight.  
6 And the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is abbreviated  
7 F-E-R-C, which is typically called the FERC or the  
8 Commission. And our federal cooperating agency partners and  
9 I would like to welcome you to this public meeting to take  
10 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or  
11 DEIS, issued by the FERC on February 7, 2014 for the Jordan  
12 Cove Local Fraction and Pacific Connector Pipeline Projects,  
13 which I'll call from now on just the project.

14 My name is Paul Friedman, and I'm the FERC  
15 environmental project manager for this project. And up here  
16 with me tonight is Steve Dush. Steve is the assistant  
17 project manager at FERC. Miriam Liberatore is the BLM  
18 project manager out of Medford District. Wes Yamamoto is  
19 the Forest Service project manager. He's out of the Tillamook  
20 Ranger District. And I see Donna Owens, his boss, the  
21 district ranger here tonight. Thanks for coming Donna.

22 Mark Mackiewicz is National Program Manager for  
23 the BLM. He's somewhere in this room. I talked to him  
24 earlier. There he is. And in the far back we have John  
25 Scott and John Crookston. I just call them the Johns, and



PM5

Continued, page 3 of 115R

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 they work for Tetra Tech, who is our third-party contractor,  
2 and they helped us produce the DEIS. And we also have the  
3 third-party contractor for the Forest Service and the BLM,  
4 North States Resources. They're represented by Paul  
5 Uncaphor. Paul you wave.

6 Let the record show that this meeting began at  
7 approximately 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 10, at the  
8 Seven Feathers Hotel in Canyonville, Oregon.

9 As you can see, right there, this meeting is  
10 being recorded and transcribed by a court reporter on behalf  
11 of the FERC so there will be accurate notes on tonight's  
12 proceedings. The court reporter is an employee of Ace  
13 Federal Reporters, Inc., an independent contractor.

14 Ace will sell copies of this transcript at  
15 various sliding scale prices, beginning from same day to  
16 five business days after this meeting. If you'd like a copy  
17 of the transcript prior to its being posted on the FERC  
18 website, you can make arrangements directly with Ace.

19 If you'd like to speak tonight, please sign the  
20 speakers' list, which the Johns are keeping at the back of  
21 the room. We will call people up to speak one at a time in  
22 the order they write their name on the list. The only thing  
23 I remind you is that you print your name legibly so that I  
24 can read it, and even then I still have trouble pronouncing  
25 people's names.

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

4

PM5

Continued, page 4 of 115

1 The production of the DEIS was a collaborative  
2 effort, involving a number of federal cooperating agencies,  
3 including the BLM, Forest Service, Corps of Engineers,  
4 Department of Energy, EPA, Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife  
5 Service, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of  
6 Transportation. The cooperating agencies had an opportunity  
7 to review an administrative draft and some agencies  
8 contributed text to the DEIS.

9 For example, the BLM and the Forest Service and  
10 their third-party contractor, wrote sections of the DEIS  
11 related to their evaluation of proposed amendments to an  
12 individual district and National Forest Land Management  
13 plans to make provision for the pipeline. In a few minutes,  
14 a representative from the BLM and the Forest Service will  
15 explain what those agencies are doing with regard to this  
16 project.

17 The FERC is an independent regulatory agency.  
18 One of the industries we regulate is the interstate  
19 transportation of natural gas. Originally, we were called  
20 the Federal Power Commission when we were created by  
21 Congress in 1920. Later, under the Carter Administration,  
22 we were reorganized and renamed. Our leaders are five  
23 people. We call them the Commissioners. They sit on the  
24 11th floor of our building, and they are the decision makers  
25 for the Commission.

PM5

Continued, page 5 of 115

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

1 And those commissioners are appointed by the  
2 President of the United States and confirmed by Congress.  
3 Usually, there are three in the party in power, so there's  
4 three Democrats and two in the opposing party, so there's  
5 two Republicans. They typically serve five-year terms.  
6 Steve and I are mere civil servants. The Commissioners take  
7 recommendations from staff prior to making decisions, and  
8 our recommendations for this project can be found in Section  
9 5.2 of the DEIS.

10 In accordance with Energy Policy Act of 2005 and  
11 the Natural Gas Act, the FERC is the lead federal agency  
12 responsible for authorizing onshore, liquefied natural gas  
13 -- another acronym, LNG -- terminals and interstate natural  
14 gas facilities. We are also the lead agency for compliance  
15 with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, another  
16 abbreviation, NEPA.

17 Our DEIS was prepared to satisfied the Council on  
18 Environmental Affairs regulations for implementing the NEPA.  
19 The full cooperating agencies can adopt the EIS for their  
20 regulatory needs to comply with the NEPA; however, each  
21 agency would make their own independent conclusions in their  
22 respective records of decision.

23 The Commission will make its record of decision  
24 in what we call a commission order. There has been no  
25 commission order issued for this project; therefore, no

PM5

Continued, page 6 of 115

20150113-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/13/2015

6

1 decision by the FERC has been made at this time. The  
2 Commissioners will not even consider making a decision until  
3 after we issue a final environmental impact statement, and  
4 that is several months off.

5 In May 21, 2013, Jordan Cove Energy Project, LLC  
6 -- we just abbreviate them as Jordan Cove -- filed an  
7 application with the FERC under Section 3 of the MGA in  
8 Docket No. CP13-483-000 seeking authority to construct and  
9 operate an LNG export terminal at Coos Bay.

10 Jordan Cove intends to produce about 6 million  
11 metric tons per year of LNG from a supply of about 1 billion  
12 cubic feet per day of natural gas. They're going to put  
13 that LNG -- LNG, by the way, is natural gas frozen to about  
14 minus 260 degrees Fahrenheit. When that happens, it reduces  
15 its volume by about 600 percent. Takes a vapor, turns it  
16 into a liquid. They put the liquid on big ships that travel  
17 across oceans.

18 They're going to export the LNG to either free  
19 trade agreement nations or non-free trade agreement nations,  
20 and they have permission to do that issued by the Department  
21 of Energy. The main facilities who will be part of the  
22 Jordan Cove complex include a 420-megawatt power plant, a  
23 natural gas processing plant, four liquefaction trains, two  
24 LNG storage tanks, a transfer pipeline and mooring platform,  
25 a marine slip with docks for LNG vessels and tugboats, and